

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

CLERK USDC EDWI
FILED

Arturo Cornejo

2025 MAR -6 P 12: 59

Plaintiff

Civil Action No. 25cv341

v.

BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO,
FIREARMS, AND EXPLOSIVES;

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION;

UNITED STATES CONGRESS
(MEMBERS TO BE LATER NAMED);

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Defendants

**COMPLAINT
FOR DECLARATORY JUDGEMENT AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

INTRODUCTION

NOW COMES Arturo Cornejo, Plaintiff *pro se*, and hereby shows to the Court that Plaintiff is currently proceeding as a *pro se* litigant and is not a seasoned attorney and therefore may require more effort and time than an attorney would in the preparation of any legal document. Moreover, it is customary to afford latitude to *pro se* litigants as affirmed by the United States Supreme Court in the case(s) of *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972), *Fogle v. Pierson*, 435 F.3d 1252 (10th Cir. 2006), *Jones v. Phipps*, 39 F.3d 158 (7th Cir. 1994), *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89 (2007), and

in *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976), wherein the Supreme Court reaffirmed that pro se litigants should be given some leeway, especially in cases involving civil rights or constitutional claims.

1. Plaintiff brings forth this action under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 USC § 552, and the Administrative Procedures Act, 5 USC § 701 et seq, for injunctive and other appropriate relief. This complaint seeks relief for the BATF's noncompliance with the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA"), 5 U.S.C. § 552 in responding to Plaintiff's request for the information and records previously sought by the Plaintiff.

2. Plaintiff also brings forth an action for deprivation of constitutional rights under US 42 § 1983 based on a series of incidents constituting a pattern and practice of misconduct and ongoing violations by this government agency, the BATF, as well as by the Congress of the United States for continuing to promote the false notion that America is a democracy, for creating bureaucracies outside the scope of its authority under the Constitution, for violating their oath of office, and also for instituting socialist/communists anti-American programs and funding these programs with American taxpayer money. Additionally, the continued practices by the BATF also constitutes a systemic problem with this agency which continues to put citizens, including Plaintiff, at risk. See *Monell v. Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978); *Kirkpatrick v. City of Los Angeles*, 803 F.3d 1219 (9th Cir. 2015); *Williams v. City of Chicago*, 733 F.3d 749 (7th Cir. 2013); and *Swint v. Chambers County Commission*, 514 U.S. 35 (1995).

3. Plaintiff also seeks a review with a determination and ruling on the constitutionality and lawful existence of the BATF. Plaintiff will in his complaint layout the reasons for why the BATF is operating outside the law, and how it has been capricious in the creation and enforcement of its rules and regulations which the BATF then enforces as law and with the imposition of severe penalties on any persons the BATF deems to be violators. Plaintiff will demonstrate clearly that the BATF has no basis under the Constitution to lawfully exist and thus no lawful authority for the enforcement of any of its rules and regulations, nor for the enforcement of any of the laws passed

by the US Congress which infringe upon the individual Right to keep and bear arms. The argument put forth in support of this notion will speak for itself with undeniable facts, truth and clarity. This complaint then is not just about seeking injunctive relief, but is also the means by which Plaintiff is seeking to be heard on a formal redress of grievances for the government's actions in continuing to operate outside the scope of its authority and outside the specific dictates and prohibitions of the Constitution. As Benjamin Franklin famously responded to Elizabeth Willing Powel's question upon his leaving the constitutional convention: "*Well, Doctor, what have we got, a republic or a monarchy?*" Franklin's response without hesitation was very brief when he told her, "*A Republic if you can keep it.*" A constitutional republic is what the Founding Fathers created, and a constitutional republic it is what is guaranteed to us by the Constitution. But we have drifted so far away from that ideal and from the Founders' intent for their posterity that if alive today, the Founders would surely not recognize this current government of the United States to be the government that they created.

PARTIES

4. Plaintiff Arturo Cornejo resides in and is a citizen of Wisconsin.
5. Defendant Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) is a federal agency of the United States, which currently operates under the authority of the US Attorney General. 28 U.S.C. § 599A. ATF is headquartered in Washington, D.C.
6. Defendant Social Security Administration is a federal agency of the United States operating under the authority of the Social Security Act and is part of the Executive Branch. Its principal main office is located in Baltimore, Maryland.
7. Defendant United States of America is a government entity. It can be sued under the Administrative Procedure Act. See 5 U.S.C. § 703.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. This court has subject-matter jurisdiction and authority to grant the requested relief under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 2201, 2202, and U.S.C. § 701 *et seq.*

9. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) (1) (C) because it is where the Plaintiff resides.

STATEMENT OF FACTS AND BACKGROUND

10. The ATF has been very difficult to understand in the ways in which it enforces its rules, regulations and laws that apply to firearms. The ATF has regularly failed to be clear on what constitutes a violation. In the case of arm braces for example, the ATF has flipped flopped more times than Plaintiff can remember on the issue of whether or not an arm brace on a firearm converts a pistol into a rifle and whether the brace can be allowed to touch the shoulder when shooting the weapon and whether or not to declare such a weapon a "short barrel rifle" (SBR) and subject the user to the cost and pain of the National Firearms Act of 1934. The ATF waited until after tens of millions of these arm braces had been legally sold and were in the hands of the public to then declare everyone in possession of one guilty of a felony. Although the ATF acknowledges that their pistol brace rule was enjoined, the ATF continues to make arrests and to prosecute citizens who have pistol braces. The agency still judges short-barreled firearms with braces on a case-by-case basis, and if they don't like the flavor of what you're up to, they'll still throw the book at you. In other words, they believe that they, in their sole discretion, get to decide how to interpret the law as well as how to enforce the law! The ATF has used a series of vague and open-ended criteria to determine if a braced pistol was intended to be fired from the shoulder to selectively pursue certain cases. However, the rules put out by the ATF provide no guidance whatsoever to owners of such pistols as to how the criteria would be applied. Instead, the ATF essentially claims that, "*We'll know an SBR when we see it.*"

11. There are also rules on the overall length of a weapon that can result in its classification as an illegal SBR, even though there are today many rifles with full length and legal 16" barrels that have an overall length shorter than an SBR because of their "bullpup" design in which the action and barrel are recessed. And because today's firearms, such as the AR platform (and many others), are modular such that the parts and components can easily be switched out, the ATF's rules on what constitutes a violation becomes very muddy. As one example, an AR15 pistol can very easily be converted to a rifle by swapping out the upper receiver with one with a longer barrel and this apparently is acceptable and legal. However, if you reverse the process and/or make a rifle into a pistol, you now have violated the law and subjected yourself to heavy fines and penalties of up to \$250,000 and 10 years in prison. Laws that create criminals without there being any victim are not laws, they are revenue generators!

12. Then there is the issue of what the ATF calls "constructive intent" whereby if you possess the components to make what is deemed to be an "illegal firearm" you are automatically deemed to have committed the crime even though you have taken no such action. It's as if you are being charged with a "thought crime". And how far will the ATF go with this notion of "constructive intent" is unknown as there are many simple ways in which one can convert a semi-auto weapon such as an AR15 into a fully automatic weapon with simple drop in parts that one can easily fabricate, such as for example from a short piece of wire from a common coat hanger. And so, does having a wire coat hanger in the home together with an AR15 constitute "constructive intent"? And understand, Plaintiff is not trying to be facetious here. The ATF prosecuted and sent to prison for five years, a young man who in the promotion of his gun store (as a licensed FFL) made available for sale a novelty item called an Auto Keycard, a credit card sized aluminum card with a design printed on it resembling that of a "lightning link". A real lightning link can be used to convert an AR15 to full automatic fire. However, this was a sales promotion novelty item that was nonfunctional and could not be used to convert any weapon into a machinegun. After the arrest, several attempts were made by ATF agents to cut out the design and bend it into a "lighting link".

However, all attempts at trying to make a machine gun from one of these Auto Keycards failed as the design was not drawn or made to spec because it was never intended for this purpose but rather, these were made to be used as a promotional novelty item. But that did not matter to the ATF, the man was still prosecuted and incarcerated (see United States v. Hoover, Case No. 3:21-cr-00022-MMH-MCR).

13. Another case is that of a Navy Sailor named Patrick Tate Adamiak who had served the Navy with pride and later had been selling legal firearms part kits part-time. A confidential informant (CI) working for the ATF contacted Adamiak for help brokering a deal for a demilled machine gun parts kit being sold on the online site, Gun Broker (a case of entrapment?). Mr. Adamiak believed the kit was demilled correctly since it was on the Gun Broker site. He purchased the kit and resold it to the CI. However, the ATF determined the kit wasn't properly demilled since it was cut with a bandsaw, not a torch. They raided Adamiak's home and arrested him. During the search, they found power tools the sailor said were being and had been used to remodel his home. But the ATF took a different view, arguing (without any evidence) that the tools were being used for making guns. The ATF also found a demilled RPG that Adamiak purchased at a flea market in California. The RPG did not have a fire control group (trigger assembly) and had a large circular hole cut in its side, and thus was NOT in any way operational. However, the ATF welded the hole shut, claiming it wasn't big enough, and also installed a fire control unit. With the RPG rebuilt and rewelded, the ATF was able to get it to work, and then thus proceeded to charge Adamiak with multiple felony violations of the National Firearms Act.

14. For this and many other reasons, Plaintiff sought answers to these kinds of questions for the purpose of finding out what specific actions constitute offenses in the eyes of the ATF. And although the Freedom of Information Act does not provide for or require a response to questions, Plaintiff submitted a FOIA request in the form of a request for records and published documents which would list what are deemed to be offenses and violations of the ATF's rules, regulations and laws that the ATF enforces, and which if provided, would inform Plaintiff as to

which specific actions the ATF considers offenses and has and would continue to prosecute, as well as to provide the corresponding charges and penalties for these offenses. If one is expected to live and abide by the laws that one is subject to, then one needs to know and understand what actions are considered illegal and what penalties can be imposed for violations. However, the ATF has never been very clear on what actions constitute violations. And although ignorance of the law cannot be used as an excuse by the accused, for the ATF to blatantly conceal the law from those that are to be subjected to it, is at the very least bordering on entrapment. Additionally, if ignorance is not an excuse for the accused, then it should also not be an excuse for the government. In fact, the government should be held to a higher standard because the government has a duty to protect constitutional rights. Also, government officials receive FREE legal representation whereas the accused must himself cover the costs of all legal expenses. In addition, in a great many cases, the government officials enjoy full immunity as they are fully indemnified for their conduct in office. – (“good faith immunity” which attempts to explain the bad action as having been done in good faith.)

15. However, on the issue of government immunity, the government likes to resort to claiming immunity, whether it be statutory immunity or sovereign immunity or any other such claim that places the government above the law. This doctrine of immunity derives from the principle that the King is God and therefore immune from any and all blame or culpability regardless of how illegal or immoral his actions might appear to be, and thus the King can do no wrong. However, in the American Revolution, we fought a revolutionary war to put an end to this notion that we can be ruled by some entity that is above the law and that can never be held accountable for his or their actions. And thus, nowhere in the Constitution is there mention of the federal government having immunity or even any mention of this idea of requiring standing in order to bring forth a case against the government. The only mention of government immunity that can be found in the Constitution is in the 11th Amendment, but its provisions only applies to suits and actions brought against one of the several states wherein this amendment says; “*The Judicial power of the United*

States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State." Thus these notions of the government having immunity were created decades later after the founding of this country and were simply made up. And this country's founding documents make clear that the new nation being created by the Framers of the Constitution was to be a republic with constitutional guarantees and protections against any violations of individual rights. Furthermore, The Declaration of Independence strongly affirms the idea of popular sovereignty, wherein it states; "*Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.*" This statement is a direct assertion that the legitimacy of government comes from the people. The Declaration goes on to say that when a government fails to secure the rights of the people, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it: "*That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government...*"

16. The people created this government to be their servant, not their ruler. The Declaration of Independence expresses the revolutionary idea that people are sovereign and have the right to decide the form of government under which they live. This is in sharp contrast to the idea of sovereignty being vested in a monarch or any other form of authoritarian rule, which the American colonists were rebelling against. And in the Preamble to the Constitution, it opens with the words: "*We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union...*" This opening phrase asserts that the authority of the Constitution rests on the collective will of the people, not on a monarch or divine right. Additionally, in Federalist No. 39, James Madison discusses the nature of the Constitution as a form of government wherein the people are the ultimate sovereign. He distinguishes between a national and federal system and argues that while the Constitution establishes a national government, it still ultimately derives its power from the people when he wrote: "*The proposed Constitution, therefore, is, in strictness, neither a national nor a federal constitution, but a composition of both. In its foundation, it is federal, not national; in*

the sources from which the ordinary powers of government are derived, it is national, not federal." And in Federalist No. 10, James Madison addresses the issue of factions (groups of people with interests contrary to the rights of others or the interests of the community as a whole) and argues that the best way to control them is through a large republic. He maintains that in a republic, the people are sovereign and will choose representatives who will act in the public interest, protecting the rights of the minority while still reflecting the will of the majority. Madison goes on to say; "*The people are sovereign, and the government must reflect the general will of the people, even as it protects minority rights from the tyranny of majority factions.*" Thus, in truth as per the Framers, it is the people that are the true sovereigns... and thus government immunity is a false notion.

17. Plaintiff on August 21st, 2024 sent his initial FOIA request letter addressed to Mr. Steven Dettelbach, Director of the BATF. An initial reply dated September 20, 2024 stated that Plaintiff's FOIA request was not proper and thus, Plaintiff's FOIA request was being "administratively closed". Plaintiff objected and went through an appeal process and amended his FOIA request in order to comply with the ATF's requirements. Then on October 9th, 2024 Plaintiff received an email from Rose Mary Kane with the message saying that Plaintiff also needed to include a completed form DOJ 361 as Plaintiff had also requested all personal files on himself. This form 361 dealing with the Privacy Act had an OMB number of 1103-0016 which also showed that the form had expired on 5/31/23. However, Plaintiff complied with the request and submitted the completed expired form. Plaintiff then found out that Ms. Kane was only involved in the request for Plaintiff's personal file information and that Plaintiff's FOIA request was being handled by a Ms. Lynette Carter, and had been issued the ATF Tracking number of 2024-02080. But when Plaintiff later reached out to Ms. Carter, she told Plaintiff that she no longer had the file and that it had been forwarded to an "intake team" for processing. After much time, and having received no further response, Plaintiff sent a second FOIA request letter on September 4, 2024. A reply from ATF was finally received on November 14th, 2024 via an email from a Ms. Ginae Barnett, stating her pronouns as (she/her/hers), in which said email included a formal acknowledgment letter from a

Mr. Hirsh D. Kravitz, Acting Chief, and which letter first, informed that Plaintiff's FOIA request now had a different assigned reference number of: 2025-50060, and also that the records Plaintiff was seeking "require a search in another office within ATF." And that because of the "unusual circumstances" the time limit to respond was being extended, and it referenced 5 U.S.C. § 552(q)(6)(B)(i)-(iii).

18. As of the date of the filing of this complaint, it has now been 195 days since Plaintiff's initial FOIA request submission and there has been no meaningful response to Plaintiff's FOIA request nor to Plaintiff's request for personal file information under the Privacy Act. Under the Freedom of Information Act, government agencies are generally required to respond to a request within 20 business days of receiving it. The FOIA statute allows for the extension of the standard 20-business-day period for a variety of reasons, and when the 5 U.S.C. § 552(q)(6)(B) provision is invoked, it typically relates to an "unusual circumstances" situation. However, even when such circumstances occur, the agency may only extend the response period for up to 10 additional business days beyond the original 20-day period. This would extend the total maximum time period for responding to 30 business days. And in rare cases, if further consultation is necessary, or if multiple agencies are involved, the time can be extended further, but the agency must notify the requester of the reason for the delay and also provide an estimated date for completion. However, as of the date of filing of this complaint, this has never been done. Plaintiff has received no further communications from the ATF since the November 14th, 2024 email. ATF is therefore in violation of the Freedom of Information Act and also the Privacy Act of 1974.

19. The ATF over the years and decades has proven to be an agency that does not follow nor obeys the law. It makes up its own rules and does not respect individual rights. The ATF Director was called in to testify before Congress on several occasions during 2023 and 2024. On one of those occasions (recorded on video), Representative Matt Gaetz questioned ATF Director, Steven Dettelbach, and here is what came out of that exchange: The ATF enforces a zero tolerance policy against licensed FFL dealers, but the hypocrisy is that the ATF does not live up

to its own standards as evidenced by the fact that the ATF has lost thousands of firearms, being the victim of burglary in some cases, and then in other cases, as with Eric Holder with his Operation Fast & Furious, literally giving the guns to Mexican Drug Cartels. The ATF has also been cited for keeping records which they were not allowed to keep and thus were illegally being kept and held by the ATF. In so many instances cited, the ATF's practices constituted a terrible abuse of power. The ATF has on occasion also been guilty of threatening FFL owners into not accepting to transfer a legal short barrel AR style pistol, or PCC (pistol caliber carbine). When this happens, the customer who has had his legal purchase sent to his local FFL cannot take possession of his purchase and must then request to have it shipped back to the vendor and then also work to make other arrangements with another FFL who will accept it and follow through with the transfer. This has even happened to people in very conservative states as the ATF bullies the gun store owner into compliance. The ATF has been able to do this because the ATF has the power by virtue of having the control over the store owner's FFL license, and consequentially, also has the control over their business and their livelihood. FFL dealers also report transacting legal firearms sales and transfers with a completed successful NICS background check. But then later, the ATF comes calling and informs the gun dealer that the background check was later changed to a "not approved" status and thus the ATF deems this to be a violation and the dealer loses his FFL license and his business and livelihood. The ATF intentionally targets FFL dealers to close them down. There have been a number of reputable and lawfully operating FFL dealers who have lost their license and their businesses thereby causing them to lose their livelihood because of ATF errors and mistakes, or just simply because of callous behavior on the part of the ATF. And there is never any accountability, and never any consequences for any of the mistakes and crimes committed by the ATF. Yet on the other hand, the government at times favors giving the criminals a break. The Justice Department under Barack Obama directed the FBI to drop more than 500,000 names of fugitives with outstanding arrest warrants from the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, according to the testimony of acting FBI deputy director David Bowdich. And the ATF Director, Steven

Dettelbach, in multiple questioning sessions before different members of Congress never seemed to have any answers for why this agency is so fraught with inefficiencies and mistakes leading to potential harm and which have also resulted in violations of the law on the part of the ATF. This behavior on the part of the ATF to interfere with the lawful transfer of a legally purchased firearm by the use of harassment and coercion is unacceptable and is yet another example of how this out of control agency operates. As Senator Rand Paul once said; "*We should never forget the Constitution wasn't written to restrain citizens' behavior. It was written to restrain the government's behavior.*" The ATF is also often times guilty of running roughshod over the Constitution in executing its warrants. The ATF is an out of control bureaucratic agency run by unelected officials. And besides routinely operating outside the scope of its authority by creating laws for which no authority exists, this agency also enforces these laws in a manner that subjects innocent people to great harm, and even death. And if one cannot see the irony in having a gun ban enforced by men with guns, then one will have completely failed to understand why the Second Amendment was written in the first place, and was made a part of our Constitution.

20. On March 19th, 2024 the ATF executed a no knock search warrant (not an arrest warrant, but a search warrant) which they intentional chose to execute with a SWAT team in the dark hours of the early morning which resulted in the death of Bryan Malinowski, the 53-year-old executive director of the Clinton National Airport in Little Rock, Arkansas. Malinowski was a law abiding citizen without any criminal record who had taken up the hobby of gun collecting. As part of his hobby of collecting, buying, and selling various items, Bryan occasionally as a weekend hobby set up a table at local gun shows where he mainly displayed guns and coins. In Arkansas a private seller may legally sell a firearm without holding a federal firearm license (FFL) and without filling out forms or conducting background checks. A private seller may do so until such time as they cross a subjectively defined barrier becoming "a person engaged in the business of selling firearms." The ATF had questions regarding Malinowski's gun collecting and the occasional private sale of his personal property. The ATF surveilled Bryan Malinowski for multiple days. They

followed him in cars. They watched him at gun shows and even purchased firearms from him. They placed a tracking device on his vehicle, and then obtained a warrant to search his car and phone. But Malinowski was not a criminal, he had no record and was also not in any way known to be a dangerous person. The ATF knew where he worked and lived and they could have approached him to question him at any time in a safe manner. However, the ATF chose instead to execute that no knock search warrant at 6:00 am on March 19, 2014, 45 minutes before first light and over one hour before sunrise. How is a man at home with his family expected to react when unannounced people suddenly break in to your home? Malinowski was probably not even guilty of having committed any crime, and at worst, Bryan Malinowski, a gun owner and gun enthusiast, maybe stood accused of making private firearm sales to a person who may not have been legally entitled to purchase the gun(s). The ATF's tactics on March 19 were at the very least reckless and incompetent, and at worst, an act of premeditated murder. This should have never been allowed to happen. The ATF intentionally created the conditions for Malinowski to be shot and killed. The manner in which that search warrant was executed was completely unnecessary, and Malinowski's death clearly preventable. The ATF's involvement at both the Waco siege and Ruby Ridge have also not been forgotten. The ATF is lawless and dangerous to the extreme and it has demonstrated repeatedly to have an absolute vacuum of morality. Very recently, on Jan. 7, 2025, Rep. Eric Burlison (R-MO) introduced a bill, H.R. 221, the "Abolish the ATF Act", a succinct, one-page bill that aims to abolish the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (BATFE). And while abolishing the ATF would be a positive step, the enforcement of anti-gun laws must also NOT be allowed to be placed in the hands of any other government agency. All anti-gun legislation must also be nullified and removed as it all clearly violates the Constitution's Second Amendment. Further down in this complaint Plaintiff will provide the legal arguments and reasons for why this agency has no lawful authority to exist and should be immediately shut down and disbanded.

THE LAW AND ISSUES OF CONSTITUTIONALITY

21. The first issue which needs to be addressed is the issue of Rights and the false notion that people have 'constitutional Rights'. Legislators and even attorneys defending their clients always seem to refer to Rights in this manner, with attorneys often stating that their client's constitutional Rights were violated. However, it is important to understand that the words in the US Constitution and the Bill of Rights did not create nor did they grant anyone any Rights as these would then be considered privileges coming from the government and which would then subject them to regulation by the government and would also make it possible for the government to suspend or revoke these "Rights". Words have specific meanings and the substitution and/or omission of words can alter their meaning. Our founding documents recognize and make it clear that our Rights are inherent and that we are all born with certain inalienable Rights which are "God given Rights". Therefore what we as Americans have are constitutionally protected Rights which are recognized as being God given, and these Rights do not require any permission from government to be exercised. In fact, it is one of the principal duties of the government to protect these Rights. The Constitution's purpose was first, to form the structure of our government and to assign specific duties and functions to those positions created by the Constitution via the specified grants or delegation of authority. Then also, the Constitution establishes some well-defined limits of power and authority being given to the newly created federal government, and this is found at Article I, Section 8 where the Constitution provides for 18 enumerated powers and grants of authority. This was an explicit directive to the federal government to, "stay in your lane" and to not venture outside of these parameters. But furthermore, the Founders still felt the need to try to ensure that the government would not seek greater power and move towards exceeding its authority and towards tyranny, and thus they wanted to define very clearly that one of the principal roles of the government was to protect individual Rights. And this was accomplished via the creation of those first ten amendments to the Constitution which we recognize as the Bill of Rights. The Preamble to the Bill of Rights states that they, the Framers, "expressed a desire, that in order

to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added..." This was their reason for the creation of those first ten amendments to the Constitution. They believed that the Constitution was incomplete without these first ten amendments. Their desire and intent was for there to be a small and limited federal government with the determining power residing locally with the states and with the people... Hence, the reason for why they finished The Bill of Rights by closing it out with the inclusion of the Tenth Amendment which very simply states, "*The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people*". However, this current US Government, seeking ever more power, has over the years and decades ventured so far off course such that much of what the government is involved in today is in fact, outside the scope of its authority under the Constitution.

22. The Rule of Law in this country includes the notion that there is a hierarchy of law and which includes accepting that the Constitution is at the very top as the Supreme Law of the Land. However, the government has intentionally overlooked and ignored what the Constitution says in order to get around the Second Amendment to create anti-gun laws and regulations which restrict the people's access to firearms. The government has basically used and relied upon the Supremacy Clause and Commerce Clause contained in the Constitution to justify its authority in being able to regulate firearms. The Supremacy Clause is found within the Constitution at Article VI, Section 2. However, the government has consistently reinterpreted and/or misinterpreted the meaning of words in the Constitution to suit its agendas. Article VI, Section 2 of the Constitution states the following: "*This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.*" The phrase, "which shall be made in pursuance thereof" makes that entire statement conditional. In other words, in order for the laws of the United States to be included under that umbrella of being

considered as part of the "Supreme Law of the Land", those new laws MUST BE MADE IN PURSUANCE THEREOF with respect to the Constitution. It is only those laws which are made in pursuance thereof, and which can be seen to be in harmony with the Constitution, that can share that distinction of being considered part of the Supreme Law of the Land. This is a test that every new piece of legislation should be subjected to and must pass before being enacted into law, and also even before being submitted for a vote. Many of the laws which have been passed are, and continue to be, from the onset, repugnant to the United States Constitution. Yet these unconstitutional laws are enacted and put into effect against the citizenry until a constitutional challenge is made. However, the burden as measured in time and expense to correct such a mistake always falls onto the citizenry, while the government with its unlimited resources and budget enjoys all upside potential and no down side risk in these matters which have as their goal, the continual eroding of the constitutional rights of the American people. And the thing that is most insulting to Americans is the fact that these actions of eroding our constitutionally protected rights are being brought forth by elected officials who swore an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution. To knowingly draft legislation that is unconstitutional, let alone to vote on passing it into law, is an act of betrayal against the American people, it is a direct violation of their oath of office, as well as a direct assault on the Constitution and should also constitute an act of treason. In the private sector, how long would you be allowed to keep your job if you regularly violated your company's written policies and/or terms of employment? Yet how many times do we not see this happen with legislators constantly "throwing new legislation at the wall to see if it will stick". And how many challenges to unconstitutionality clutter our courts every year?

23. The United States Supreme Court upholds this notion of the people always having the protections and guarantees of our constitutionally protected Rights with a number of Supreme Court rulings which include the following:

"The Constitution of these United States is the supreme law of the land. Any law that is repugnant to the Constitution is null and void of law." - Marbury v. Madison, 5 US 137.

Additionally, *"An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; affords no protection; it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed."* Norton v. Shelby County, 118 U.S. 425.

"Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them." Miranda vs. Arizona, 384 US 436 p. 491.

Constitutional Right – *"A right guaranteed to the citizens by the Constitution and so guaranteed as to prevent legislative interference therewith".* - Delaney v. Plunkett, 146 Ga. 547, 91 S. E. 561, 567, L. R. A. 1917D, 926, Ann. Cas. 1917E, 685. – Black's Law Dictionary, 3rd Edition.

"The Constitution is a legal binding contract between the government and its employer (the American people). The U.S. Supreme Court was right when it said, "The Constitution is a written instrument and as such its meaning does not alter, that which it meant when it was adopted, it means now!" U.S. vs. South Carolina (1905)

"The U.S. Supreme Court broadly and unequivocally held that licensing or registration of any Constitutional Right is itself unconstitutional." -- Follett vs. McCormick, S.C., 321 U.S. 573 (1944)

24. The government, in its regulation of firearms, also uses and/or relies on the Commerce Clause found in Article I, Section 8 (3) as the justification for having the authority to regulate firearms. Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution spells out and lists the specified very limited "enumerated powers" being granted to the federal government. Then specifically, Section 8

(3) authorizes the regulation of commerce. However, the clear intent of Article I, Section 8 was to only grant specified limited powers as a way to limit the federal government's authority. And the word "commerce" was, and still is today, considered to mean the commercial and social intercourse between citizens of different states or nations. The federal government was being granted the very limited power to regulate that traffic of goods between the different states and other nations so as to provide a level playing field between the states whereby no state could impose duties and taxes on another state. Of particular importance here is the prevention of protectionist state policies that would favor state citizens or businesses at the expense of non-citizens conducting business within that state. And this is in fact specifically spelled out further down in Article I, Section 9, Clause 6 where it says: "*No Preference shall be given by any Regulation of Commerce or Revenue to the Ports of one State over those of another: nor shall Vessels bound to, or from, one state, be obligated to enter, clear, or pay Duties in another.*" Helping to facilitate commerce between the States and other nations in a way that was both fair and equitable was very clearly the true intent for the granting of this limited authority to the federal government. *It was never intended to give the federal government the authority to be able to arbitrarily ban or unfairly regulate the manufacture or sale of goods that were, and always had been, legal to own.* This granting of power under the Commerce Clause was in fact intended to be limited, for if not, then the federal government would surely have full power and authority over the whole economy, the whole system of exchange and all interrelated gainful economic activity throughout the entire country... And this would clearly not have been what the Founding Fathers ever would have approved of as they were clearly of the mindset of creating a small central government with very limited powers so as to maintain the real power within the collection of the States united. The states were to maintain their independent sovereignty and the creation of the federal government was to be limited as per the enumerated powers and delegated authority in Article I, Section 8. But also, bear in mind the wording of Article I, Section 8 (3) which says: "*To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;*" This clearly means *the commerce between the several States and NOT commerce*

being conducted solely within any given State. Therefore, the Commerce Clause only involved the granting of a limited authority to the federal government to regulate the "interstate" traffic of goods and did NOT include nor impact in any way the "intrastate" movement of goods. And so if a company manufactures goods and then limits its sales to only residents within the same state of manufacture, then the federal government has absolutely no authority to regulate any such activity... Or at least that is the way it was supposed to be until we allowed politicians and attorneys to misinterpret, bastardize and to distort the meaning of the words and phrases left to us by the Framers of our Constitution. The government today via the ATF unlawfully imposes strict regulations on firearms manufacturers who only distribute and sell their products within their state and do not engage in commerce outside the borders of their state. This has been especially true in cases where a company manufacturers firearm suppressors and then only sells them to residents within the border of their state of manufacture. The government via the ATF seems to have a special dislike for firearm suppressors which are in fact safety devices which protects a firearm user from injury to his/her hearing.

THE CONSTITUTION AS A COVENANT

25. The religious idea of covenant was particularly and profoundly important in the evolution and inspiration of the American Constitution. With this mindset, in a sense the Constitution of the American republic was formed long before the Constitution of the United States was drafted in the summer of 1787. These early pilgrims and immigrants were obsessed with the covenant, relying on this handy instrument to explain almost every relation of man to man, and man to God. But the concept of covenant was particularly dominant and central in three respects; in religious doctrine theology in the church, in government, and in civil or political organization. With their covenant theology background, Americans in 1787 viewed a constitution as "a fundamental law designed by the people to be separate from and controlling of all the institutions of government". And a basic principle of covenantalism was the idea of fixed immutable supreme law. In accordance

with covenant theory then, a civil constitution needed to be the supreme inviolable law of society. The U.S. Government as created by the Constitution stands out as one of the world's most unique forms of government. Quite simply, the Constitution creates a "Federal Republic, and distributes authority and power among the three branches while recognizing the sphere sovereignty of the States." The reason the Framers decided to divide power between the States and National Government and diffuse it among three branches at both levels was to ensure that absolute sovereignty "is nowhere lodged in civil government." The Framers recognized that only God is sovereign, and therefore civil government could not be; God is the final authority, not man, either individually or corporately. Herbert Titus stated that "*a unity of civil powers in one body tends to corrupt it toward tyranny.*" There are three principle tenets of federalism directly embodied in the Constitution; dual sovereignty, separation of powers, and checks and balances. In the Preamble to the Constitution we see that the great aims set forth were for a "more perfect Union... Justice... domestic Tranquility... common defence... general Welfare... Blessings of Liberty" – All of these were aims that the States acting alone could not satisfy. The Constitution was crafted to create a National Government strong enough to accomplish these aims set forth in the Preamble, but while still being limited enough to protect individual liberty.

26. The Constitution is therefore a contract and the parties to this contract are (1) the government (as the drafter of the document), and (2) We the People. And this notion has been reinforced by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Martin v. Hunter's Lessee*, 14 U.S. (1 Wheat.) 304 (1816), in which the Court stated: "*The Constitution of the United States was ordained and established not by the States in their sovereign capacities, but emphatically, as the preamble of the Constitution declares, by 'the people of the United States.'*" And also in *McCulloch v. Maryland*, 17 U.S. (4 Wheat.) 316 (1819), in which the Court emphasized that the Constitution was established directly by the people, not by the states when it said: "*The government proceeds directly from the people; is 'ordained and established' in the name of the people.*"

27. In all past cases involving the peoples' Right to keep and bear arms, the government has always engaged in their own interpretation and reinterpretation of the words contained in the Second Amendment. However, in dealing with any ambiguity in contracts, the legal principle known as *contra proferentem* is what is always customarily applied. This principle states that any ambiguity in a contract should be interpreted against the interests of the party who provided the wording. This of course means that the ambiguity is interpreted in favor of the party that did not write the contract. However, this certainly has not been the case as there have been so many arguments over what the Second Amendment was intended to do, and with the meanings of the individual words, and over such ridiculous arguments as to what constitutes a "protected" firearm under the Second Amendment when in reality, this amendment does NOT protect any class of firearm or weapon. The very clearly stated purpose of the Second Amendment was to provide a clearly stated prohibition on government actions. The Second Amendment could not in fact be stated any more clearly in what it says in those 27 words. "*A well-regulated Militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the Right of the people to keep and bear arms Shall Not be infringed*". This amendment is somewhat unique in that it states the very reason for its creation in those first 13 words, then in the last 14 words states the actual Right being espoused. This amendment's very clearly stated purpose is to secure freedom and liberty and recognizes that this can only be the case if the people do NOT allow the government to have a monopoly of force. The people themselves are the Militia and they should have the means by which to ensure that they are well-regulated (meaning trained in the use of their weapons and in working together as a group force) as the people are the only ones that can truly defend against an enemy challenging their Right to life, liberty and freedom. In the 1939 case of United States v. Miller which ruling determined, after referencing the autobiography of Benjamin Franklin, that the term "Well Regulated" in the Second Amendment meant "Well Manned and Equipped" in the year 1791. In addition, the case of United States v. Miller also determined that the term "Arms" refers to "Ordinary Military Weapons" (not crew operated). American Citizens have the right to Keep and Bear, which means Own and Carry.

any weapons that a soldier carries into battle. That includes past, present and future weapons. A Militia consisted of armed volunteers willing to fight with their own personal arms and not under government control. And the importance of this is easily understood when we remember that in WW II the Japanese after their successful attack on Pearl Harbor decided against the idea of invading America simply because they feared that "*there would be a gun behind every blade of grass*". This means then that the people should always have access to personal firearms, ammunition and any other ancillary tools or equipment needed to train and become proficient in the use of firearms. The last 14 words making up the second phrase of the Second Amendment is the actual Right being espoused in this amendment and is being put forth as an explicit prohibition placed on the government. And the Framers intentionally used a "command directive" in how they stated that, "*the Right of the people to keep and bear arms Shall Not be infringed*". The use of the word "SHALL" or in the negative, "SHALL NOT" implies mandatory and compulsory behavior and thereby removes and eliminates all discretion and also makes clear that it is not subject to any reinterpretation of its very clear meaning. Courts every day make rulings in contract disputes regarding the requirements of the parties to perform under the terms of their contract and when the contract calls for a certain performance or action wherein the word used is, "shall" or shall not", it becomes very clear which party MUST perform and adhere to the dictates of the contract. When Moses met with God on Mount Sinai, Moses was given the tablet with the Ten Commandments. And these are referred to as commandments because of the extensive use of the word "shall", and/or in the negative, shall not" which convey and assert the commands being given by God. The truth of the matter is that if the government adheres strictly to the explicit directives and prohibitions of the Constitution, any and all anti-gun laws or regulations seeking to prohibit or license firearms or to impose in any way a fee for the exercise of this Right within the United States of America is in fact a direct infringement on this constitutionally protected Right as it clearly violates the Second Amendment. The government recognizes that it cannot tax or require licensing on the right to vote nor can it tax or require a license for the right to free speech, how then can the government justify

taxing and requiring licensing for the right to keep and bear arms? Furthermore, the Second Amendment is very clearly and purposefully stated... and there clearly are NO requirements for guns to have a so-called "sporting purpose". In fact, 'arms' are any weapon that can be used to wage war by individual Americans to defend the country and the Constitution from outside enemies and/or from enemies within our country. Furthermore, if the Founding Fathers would have ever in any way entertained the wild and crazy notion of including such a requirement as for there to be a so-called "sporting purpose" attached to "the Right of the people to keep and bear arms", Plaintiff has no doubt that the only sporting purpose the Framers of the Constitution would have ever entertained would have been the shooting of tyrants!

28. Plaintiff holds the belief that there are two main mistakes that the patriot gun community has continuously made. The first is to accept or believe that it is the Constitution or the Second Amendment which grants the people the Right to keep and bear arms, as they are often heard mentioning and referring to "exercising their Second Amendment Right", rather than the truth, which is that the Constitution prohibits government's infringement of this recognized God given Right. The second mistake is in making the association and/or in any way validating the incorrect notion that the purpose and reason for the Second Amendment is for the purpose of personal self-defense, and then also, in accepting the notion that only certain less dangerous firearms and weapons are "protected" by the Second Amendment. At the time of the Constitution's writing, hunting and personal self-defense from both two and four legged attackers was a given and required no written law or permission from government or from anyone else. The idea that the Second Amendment is about the people's right to hunt, sport & target shoot and for personal self-defense from two and four legged attackers is as ridiculous a notion as to expect that a law needs to be passed in order to give the people permission from the government to breathe the air or to drink the water from a river or stream. In fact, the Second Amendment states very clearly the reason for its existence as "being necessary to the security of a free state" and thus the meaning and the true intent of this amendment was in the Framers recognizing that the people needed to

always have unfettered access to arms in order to form their people's Militia. And so because this was about defending against tyranny and having the ability and the means by which to wage war, there is no limitation as to what constitutes "arms". Make no mistake, the Second Amendment is not about any technology, and it actually isn't even really about guns. It is about a principle. It is about the principle that the people should always have the Right, and also the ability, together with the means, by which to overthrow a tyrannical government if and when that should ever become necessary in order to preserve their freedom. And that principle is as valid today as it was back in 1791... And maybe even more so today in the year 2025 with what we have been seeing happening all around us. But also consider that just in the last century, right after World War II in 1946, we saw the true purpose for the Second Amendment being carried out in Athens, Tennessee in what is recorded in history as, The Battle of Athens.

29. The Battle of Athens: At the end of World War II, returning US veterans came home to find that their small town had been taken over by a corrupt and tyrannical cabal who had implanted themselves in all the key positions of the local government which included the Mayor's office and the local Sheriff's office. The towns' people were being abused and extorted by the corrupt political system. Attempts were made to correct these problems via the legal channels, but of course, the cabal also controlled the courts. Now with the returning veterans back home, another means was put into action. They ran for office against the establishment power, and they were sure that they had secured enough votes to change the balance of power. However, as is usually the case, the cabal did not give up and resorted to hijacking the ballot boxes saying that they would conduct the vote count in another location. An emergency meeting of the towns' people was held and it was very clear what was going to happen if this remote secret vote count was allowed to take place. Then one of the veterans stood up and with his right arm raised high and holding a set of keys yelled out; "*I've got the keys to the armory!*" And with that, the people, led by the veterans, rushed to arm themselves with every piece of military grade weapon available to them, including fully automatic weapons and explosives. The cabal was confronted and asked to

surrender the ballot boxes but they refused. A fire fight ensued and the rest is history. The towns' people, because they had the means to defend their freedom, prevailed and forced the cabal into surrendering. The governor of the state called in the National Guard, but the fight was over by then and the governor, learning of what had happened, sided with the town's people and the only charges brought were against the cabal. This right here is a prime example of the true reason for why Americans have the Second Amendment. And even in the more recent case of New York State Rifle & Pistol Association, Inc. v. Bruen, the U.S. Supreme Court addressed this very important issue regarding gun rights and the interpretation of the Second Amendment. That ruling emphasized that, in cases involving the Second Amendment, courts must examine the historical context of the right to bear arms by looking back to how the law was understood and applied at the time of the founding of the United States. And if this is done, it becomes obviously and undeniably clear that it was NEVER about hunting and sport shooting!

30. Again, an important attribute of the Constitution is that this document is recognized as a contract. And as such, the Constitution is subject to the same rules of contract law as all other contracts and agreements and this includes the notion that once the document is amended, the new terms, provisions, conditions and the directives of the amendment override and supersede all that came before it. Thus, if there are any areas of conflict or disputes between what is in the original document and what is in the amendment, it is always the terms, provisions and the directives of the amendment that shall and must prevail. In any and all contract dispute cases, this is how the courts have always ruled and continue to rule to this very day. Under our system of law, the terms, conditions, provisions and the directives of an amendment always trump what is in the original document. Therefore, even if the government's claim of authority using the Supremacy Clause and the Commerce Clause of the Constitution was accepted as being valid to give the government the authority to regulate firearms, the mere fact that there is an amendment that very explicitly bars the government from taking any such action should be enough to squash and invalidate any attempt at infringing on this protected Right of the people to keep and bear arms.

Because, absent any amendment which specifically addresses and alters the provisions of the Second Amendment, the Second Amendment stands as originally written and remains as "The Supreme Law of the Land".

31. And a specific case in history which goes towards proving this notion just expressed above, is the case of Prohibition. The 66th US Congress enacted H.R. 6810, the Volstead Act, which went into effect on January 17, 1920. The purpose of this legislation was to provide for the enforcement of Prohibition. However, this act of the Congress would have never been possible had it not been that BEFORE doing so, enough support had been gathered to push forth this idea of banning alcoholic beverages and which then resulted in the passing and ratification of the 18th Amendment to the Constitution on January 16th, 1919 and which made the manufacture, sale and distribution of alcoholic beverages illegal after it was to take effect one year later on January 17th, 1920 thereby ushering in the era of Prohibition. But then as history shows us, it did not take long for the government to realize that this had been a huge mistake as more alcohol was being consumed after Prohibition than ever before, and the sale of this illegal liquor was also fueling the growth of organized crime. The gangster mobs that dealt in bootlegging were making millions and tens of millions of dollars and not paying a cent in taxes. And the government was failing miserably at trying to put a stop to the sale and consumption of illegal liquor. It was the Roaring Twenties and everyone was having a grand ole time. The only losers were the government who now with record sales of alcoholic beverages was not collecting a dime in tax revenue on this illicit liquor. So what could the government do to reverse and correct this problem? Simple right? Just pass another act of the Congress to repeal the Volstead Act, or how about a presidential executive order to end Prohibition? But unfortunately, neither of those would do, and why? Because the 18th Amendment had made Prohibition "The Law of the Land", and thus only with another amendment which specifically addressed the provisions of the 18th Amendment could any lawful change be made. And so they worked towards getting another amendment passed and ratified which would specifically address the provisions of the 18th Amendment. And it was only after ratification of the

21st Amendment, which was proposed on February 20, 1933, and ratified on December 5, 1933, that the era of Prohibition finally came to an end. The Constitution is very clear that only via the amendment process can the Constitution be changed, and this means that only with another amendment can the effects of a previous amendment be changed or altered in any lawful way. However, no such change has ever occurred with respect to the provisions of the Second Amendment. Congress has completely ignored the requirements under the Constitution and also disregarded their oath of office by moving forward prematurely to enact legislation which very clearly was designed and intended to violate the very clear command directive of the Second Amendment of "Shall not be infringed". But absent any change to the Second Amendment via the constitutional amendment process, the Second Amendment still stands as originally written and thus, "*the Right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed*" remains as the Supreme Law of the Land.

32. It is however curiously interesting to note that at times when no constitutional amendment was required, the government took the unnecessary steps to go through the effort of passing and ratifying another amendment to the Constitution. We just recently witnessed the newly elected president, Donald J. Trump, being sworn into office on January 20th, 2025. However, throughout America's history, every newly elected president up to and including FDR for his first term in 1933 was sworn in on March 4th. The only exception to this was George Washington as he was the first president and his swearing in was delayed until April 30, 1789. Now as to why the March 4th date, there is nothing in the Constitution regarding when to seat and swear in a newly elected president. The March 4th date had been selected simply by convention due to the fact that the newly created government under the Constitution took effect on March 4, 1789... but there was no legal or constitutional requirement for adhering to this date. Elections were chosen to be held during that time of the year when the people in rural areas (which in colonial days was almost everyone) would be finished with their harvesting and had the time to travel... thus in November. But as time passed, the long period between elections and seating a new president began to be

looked at unfavorably and there was a desire to shorten this period and to move up the date of the ceremony to swear in the newly elected president. The decision to move this date up into January was an easy one to get support for, and this simple change could have very easily been taken care with an act of the Congress as there would have been no violation of the Constitution in doing so. Yet the government took the unnecessary time and trouble to satisfy the required steps needed to pass and ratify the 20th Amendment, and which is how the date for swearing in a newly elected president got moved to January 20th. However, in the case of firearms regulation, the government has seen fit to run roughshod over the Constitution and to pass unconstitutional gun regulation laws in clear violation of the Constitution's Second Amendment! The government has never taken, nor even attempted to take, the necessary steps required under the Constitution to bring about any change or alteration of the provisions of the Second Amendment BEFORE the making of unconstitutional laws which clearly violate the provisions, directives and prohibitions stated in the Second Amendment. The constitutional process for making any such changes is clearly stated in the Constitution document and every single member of Congress is well aware of this process and of the strict requirements needed to be adhered to in order to make changes to the Constitution. If someone does not like a certain law or some part of the Constitution, then the only lawful option is to work towards changing the law, but not to ignore and to violate it. Legislators are bound by an oath of office to uphold and defend the Constitution, and therefore, legislators who have supported and voted for laws that infringe on the Second Amendment have committed treason against the Constitution and do not deserve to be allowed to remain in Congress. In fact, many that hold high positions in our government should have been removed because as reported by Attorney Todd Calender, FOIA requests unearthed an astounding reality, which is that the proper affidavits do not exist or are defective, thus *no valid or notarized oaths of office were taken by those in the current (Biden) administration.* Todd Calender went on to say, "*It's statistically impossible for all the affidavits to be defective, yet they are. What does that tell you about the government that's running us?*" Additionally, in the case of *Brunson v. Adams*, the claim was made

that members of the U.S. Congress violated their oaths of office by not properly investigating allegations of election fraud in the 2020 Presidential Election. A significant number of members of Congress expressed concerns regarding the integrity of the election. Specifically, 147 members of Congress (including 139 Republicans and 8 Senators) voiced their objections to the certification of the electoral results, citing concerns about potential election fraud or irregularities. Brunson contended that Congress's actions were in direct violation of their oath to "support and defend the Constitution," particularly the constitutional provisions related to ensuring a fair and lawful election process. If the Congress was truly in service to the American people, they would have recognized that it was NOT too much to ask for there to be a "pause" in the process in order to allow for an investigation, especially given that there were 147 members of Congress who had expressed concerns regarding the integrity of the election. It is clear to see that today's US Congress fails in many ways to properly and honestly represent the best interests of the American people.

33. Plaintiff herein submits the following to the court as evidence of how the Founders viewed the Rule of Law under the Constitution, and of the reverence they had for the principles enshrined in this important document. A short review of this history helps to show how today's legislators have gotten so far off course and away from the principles the Framers believed in and espoused and wrote about in their time, and also, of the danger of not adhering with fidelity to the dictates of the Supreme Law of the Land.

John Dickenson asked this question; "*For who are a Free People? Not those over whom government is reasonable and equitably exercised, but those who live under a government so constitutionally checked and controlled, that proper provision is made against its being otherwise exercised.*"

And as St. George Tucker said; "*It is the due restraint and not the moderation of rulers that constitutes a state of Liberty. As the power to oppress though never exercised, does a state of slavery.*"

There is a reason for why the Constitution provides only 18 enumerated powers to the federal government, which is to allow it to operate in certain cases only. It has the Legislative powers on defined and limited objects, beyond which it cannot extend its jurisdiction. The government's powers are enumerated, and so to act in an arbitrary manner and do as it pleases outside its well defined boundaries is usurpation and theft of power. Arbitrary government was how the Founders defined tyranny and was one of the grievances in the Declaration of Independence. The "customary weapon" to destroy freedom is how George Washington described the danger of turning a blind eye to violations of the Constitution, and he was not alone in this belief. The Founders warned us that every over step, every excuse, and every precedent sets us on the dangerous path to tyranny. It is even the smallest violations and usurpations of power that are the most dangerous as these are thrown out there in order to set a precedent for future use in order to further encroach upon the Constitution at a later date and lead us down the slippery slope to tyranny.

Thomas Jefferson had this to say; "*To take a single step beyond the boundaries thus specially drawn around the powers of Congress, is to take possession of a boundless field of power, no longer susceptible of any definition.*"

And St. George Tucker further went on to say; "*If in a limited government the public functionaries exceed the limits which the Constitution prescribes to their powers, every such act is an act of usurpation in the government, and as such, treason against the sovereignty of the people, which is thus endeavored to be subverted, and transferred to the usurpers.*"

"Necessity is the plea for every infringement of human freedom. It is the argument of tyrants; it is the creed of slaves." -- William Pitt the Younger.

Samuel Adams said; *"The people hold the invasion of their Rights & Liberties the most horrid rebellion and a Neglect to defend them against any Power whatsoever the highest treason."*

George Washington in his farewell address had this to say: *"If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any way particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit, which the use can at any time yield."*

– George Washington

James Madison on his last day in office was presented with a new piece of legislation which although he politically favored the intended goal, he vetoed the bill. Why? Because, even though one may be politically in favor of the goal and in agreement with what a piece of legislation is attempting to accomplish, if it does not align with the Constitution, the oath of office requires a rejection of the legislation.

A government established and founded on the principle of being a government of the people, by the people and for the people, can only remain a servant government if it remains faithfully obedient to the Constitution, and if not, it soon becomes tyrannical. The biggest lie we as Americans have come to know in dealing with the government is when we hear them say to us, *"We're from the government and we're here to help you".*

34. Over the many years, many cases have come before the courts challenging the many attacks to the Second Amendment and to individual gun Rights. And as James Otis Jr. said, "So long as people will submit to arbitrary measures, so long will they find masters." And in these numerous cases the parties have danced around the many issues we have heard about in trying to redefine the words and meaning of the Second Amendment and even inserting other interpretations that they pulled from who knows where. We have heard them argue over gun features, magazine capacities and over the attributes of certain firearms that some legislators for some reason did not like because "they found them too scary", and also whether or not there is an established "common use" or historical use and if there was any "sporting purpose use", and even resorting to trying to make the argument that some guns are just too dangerous. However, in their writing and incorporating the Second Amendment into our United States Constitution, the Founding Fathers were NOT worried about specific types of guns. What they were worried about was specific types of governments... such as those that can more easily turn tyrannical and against the people! So, the more dangerous the gun, the better. Guns are made to be dangerous, because when one is in need of a weapon in order to defend oneself against an enemy, especially a powerful enemy, having the most dangerous weapon available at your disposal is what you want. But in all of these cases, the courts have ignored the main and most important issue which Plaintiff has vocalized above. The Second Amendment is not about any technology, and it's not really even about guns. It's about a principle, the principle that the people should always have the Right to keep and bear arms in order to have the ability and the means by which to defend against and to overthrow a tyrannical government if and when that should ever become necessary in order to preserve their freedom. And even President Abraham Lincoln voiced this same sentiment when he said the following; "*We the people are the rightful masters of both Congress and the courts, not to overthrow the Constitution but to overthrow the men who pervert the Constitution.*"

35. The government and the courts by using precedents based on past court rulings have created new laws based and built upon the decisions of prior case rulings and these have

been used to create or codify and confirm new anti-gun laws. But a judge's job is to apply the law, not to make the law. Thomas Jefferson had this say; "*To consider judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions is a very dangerous doctrine indeed, and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy.*" The courts have developed and use a doctrine known as stare decisis, which generally requires courts to adhere to precedent in making their decisions. But when a precedent is flawed, can it really be used to make new rulings and thereby alter the law? In *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), the Supreme Court directly overturned the precedent of *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1893), which had upheld the constitutionality of "separate but equal" public accommodations. The Court in *Brown* recognized that "separate but equal" usually did not result in equality and determined that the *Plessy* precedent violated the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment. So, it is clear that if a prior ruling is found to be unconstitutional, the Court has the power, and the duty, to overturn it, even if it was a widely followed precedent. This ensures that judicial decisions are consistent with the Constitution. The Court's power of judicial review, established in *Marbury v. Madison* (1803), gives courts the authority to declare laws or previous rulings unconstitutional if they violate the Constitution. Therefore, if a precedent conflicts with the Constitution, it can, and should be, overturned, as the Constitution is the Supreme Law of the Land. Furthermore, the Constitution's status as the Supreme Law of the Land (Article VI, Clause 2) means that all courts MUST interpret the Constitution as their highest authority. Neither new laws nor any reinterpretation by the courts can alter the Constitution or be used to violate what is written in the Constitution as amended. And it appears the courts (at least in some cases now) are beginning to recognize this. In a recent case, the United States District Court for the District of Kansas ruled that the federal ban on machine guns, under 18 U.S.C. § 922(o), is unconstitutional. This ruling stems from the case of *United States v. Tamori Morgan*, where the court found that prohibiting the possession of machine guns violates the Second Amendment. Today, the ATF regularly goes after anyone involved in the sale or use of any device that enhances a firearm's rate of fire, even though these devices such as bump stocks, binary triggers and forced reset

triggers were all deemed legal (just like the pistol arm brace). But also understand that fully automatic machine guns were legal for civilian ownership up until 1986. They are rare today because they were made illegal. And because they are rare, they are not in "common use" (which is another criteria looked at to decide whether or not to judge a firearm as being "protected" by the Second Amendment. And so because machine guns are banned, they continue to be rare and not in common use. And this is a clear example of the circular logic that the anti-gun people and the courts have been using to infringe on the people's protected Right to keep and bear arms.

36. And as this complaint moves closer towards being filed, a new executive order entitled, Protecting Second Amendment Rights was just signed on February 7th, 2025 by President Donald J. Trump. This EO starts with this statement; "*The Second Amendment is an indispensable safeguard of security and liberty. It has preserved the right of the American people to protect ourselves, our families, and our freedoms since the founding of our great Nation. Because it is foundational to maintaining all other rights held by Americans, the right to keep and bear arms must not be infringed."* This EO goes on to call for a plan of action to review existing firearms regulation stating that; *In developing such proposed plan of action, the Attorney General shall review, at a minimum:*

(i) *All Presidential and agencies' actions from January 2021 through January 2025 that purport to promote safety but may have impinged on the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens;*

(ii) *Rules promulgated by the Department of Justice, including by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, from January 2021 through January 2025 pertaining to firearms and/or Federal firearms licensees;*

(iii) *Agencies' plans, orders, and actions regarding the so-called "enhanced regulatory enforcement policy" pertaining to firearms and/or Federal firearms licensees;*

And so it appears evident by this EO that the new Trump administration also sees evidence of abuse in this area of firearms regulation by the ATF as well as by the Department of Justice. Many patriotic Americans are of course cheering this initiative by the President as they have for a long time been vocal about having to defend and protect the Second Amendment. However, Plaintiff would disagree with those that speak of having or needing to defend and/or protect the Second Amendment as Americans do NOT need to defend, protect or restore the Second Amendment.

What Americans need to do is to simply invoke it. Because, since it was first incorporated into our Constitution, the Second Amendment has never been changed, altered or modified by any lawful means and as such, under the provisions and directives of the Constitution which make clear that the Constitution can only be changed via the constitutional amendment process, the Second Amendment stands today unaltered and unchanged and remains as the Supreme Law of the Land and very clearly and unambiguously prohibits the government from interfering or infringing on the individual right to keep and bear arms. We the people therefore only need to INVOKE the Second Amendment!

NULLIFICATION

37. Nullification is the rightful remedy for all unconstitutional acts and all usurpations of power. That's how Thomas Jefferson put it, but he was far from alone in believing this. To understand this notion, it must first be recognized that power comes from the people and government is merely their agent. Here's how George Mason put it in 1776, when he also added, "*all power is vested in and consequently derived from the people*". This principle was expressed by many during Colonial times, but James Wilson put it this way, "*The truth is that in our governments the Supreme absolute and uncontrollable power remains in the people.*" And thus when we analyze this we see that the people are the source of all power, and so the government isn't Sovereign, and it doesn't hold final Authority, it isn't a master, it's a servant, it's an agent. And to reiterate this from St George Tucker, who said, "*It being one of the great fundamental principles of the American*

government that the people are sovereign and those who administer the government their agents and servants, not their kings and Masters." And when you have an agent carry out some duties for you in whatever kind of situation, it's probably a good idea to give the agent some rules to guide him, and thus, this is the whole point of a written Constitution. And this brings us to a core principle, which is that the Constitution is supreme, and so what we then have is constitutional Supremacy. It is not just the acts of government nor the opinions on the Constitution by people in government, because none of that replaces constitutional Supremacy. Here's how Thomas Jefferson put it in the Kentucky Resolutions of 1798 when he said, "*The government created by this compact was not made the exclusive or final judge of the extent of the powers delegated to itself since that would have made its discretion, and not the Constitution, the measure of its powers.*" So again, the Constitution is supreme and not the discretion of the people in government. Even Chief Justice John Marshall hammered this home in Marbury v. Madison 1803 when he wrote that, "*In declaring what shall be the supreme law of the land, the Constitution itself is first mentioned and not the laws of the United States, as generally those only which shall be made in pursuance of the Constitution have that Rank.*" And thus the logical result of that is that he further added, "*Thus the particular phraseology of the Constitution of the United States confirms and strengthens the principle supposed to be essential to all written constitutions that a law repugnant to the Constitution is void and that courts as well as other departments are bound by that instrument.*" And so that would mean that whether it's a court or an executive or a legislator, it doesn't matter, they're all below the Constitution and thus anything that they do that goes beyond the authority granted them under the Constitution is void. Thus in America, no branch of government is supreme, the government as a whole is not supreme, it is the Constitution that is Supreme, and that is the set of rules that comes from the final Authority, the supreme power of the people of the several States. And this all goes towards confirming this essential core principle, that anything that goes beyond the limits of the Constitution is void and a nullity. Even Alexander Hamilton reiterated this same principle in Federalist number 78 in May of 1788 when he said, "*There is no position which depends on clearer*

principles than that every Act of a delegated authority contrary to the tenor of the commission under which it is exercised is void. No legislative act therefore contrary to the Constitution can be valid. To deny this would be to affirm that the deputy is greater than his principal, that the servant is above his master, and that the representatives of the people are superior to the people themselves, and that men acting by virtue of powers may do, not only what their powers do not authorize, but what they forbid." Thomas Jefferson reiterated again this same principle in his Kentucky Resolutions of 1798 in which he said in the first paragraph, "*When so ever the general government assumes undelegated Powers, its acts are unauthorized, void and of No Force.*" Alexander Hamilton put it this way in Federalist number 33 in discussing the supremacy clause. He said "*But it will not follow from this doctrine that acts of the large society which are not pursuant to its Constitutional Powers, but which are invasions of the residuary authorities of the smaller societies will become the supreme law of the land these will be merely acts of usurpation and will deserve to be treated as such.*" In our constitutional system, anything beyond the limits of the Constitution is a usurpation of power, and represents a theft of power and that is unjust and therefore it is not law and it ought not to be obeyed. "*That which is not just is not law, and that which is not law ought not to be obeyed.*" For Acts of Congress to be binding they must be made pursuant to the Constitution. Thomas Jefferson summed it up like this in his draft for the Kentucky Resolutions of 1798 when he said, "*Where powers are assumed which have not been delegated, a nullification of the ACT is the rightful remedy.*" – Plaintiff herein seeks the undoing of this wrong of the unconstitutional infringement of the people's Right to keep and bear arms to be corrected by the simple act of nullification.

AN ARMED SOCIETY IS A POLITE SOCIETY

38. First of all, advocates of so-called gun control do not remember or do not know their history and therefore do not realize that so-called "gun control" laws besides being unconstitutional, are also racist. The history of gun control in America began after the Civil War in the Southern States as an effort to preserve slavery and for the suppression of the black man. Southern states

enacted 'Black Codes' which barred the black freedmen from exercising basic civil rights, including the right to bear arms. Mississippi's provision was typical: No freedman "shall keep or carry firearms of any kind, or any ammunition." Under the Mississippi law, a person informing the government about illegal arms possession by a freedman was entitled to receive the forfeited firearm. Whites were forbidden to give or lend to any freedman firearms or knives. Racist groups like the white supremacist organization known as the *Ku Klux Klan* were very instrumental in pushing for this kind of legislation, and we all know what the intent and goals of the KKK were. So let us not be fooled into thinking that the anti-gun progressives hate guns, because it's not the guns they hate, but rather it is a citizen group with an opposing view that is well armed and therefore not easily controlled that is troubling them. Our founding fathers recognized that there is a dark force in the world that is organized, intelligent and vicious and that is forever attempting to subdue mankind and the rest of humanity by any means to achieve their end, including the mass killing of innocent people. And history has shown us that more people have been killed in the 20th century by their own government than by all wars combined.

"Justice without force is powerless, force without justice is tyrannical". – Blaise Pascal

39. In addressing the concerns of the anti-gun lobby and of those who believe that the world would be better off if all guns were eliminated, let us first consider where most all of the violence occurs and is being committed in the US in which the tool used was a gun. In examining these events, we can easily and clearly see that so-called 'gun violence' happens in democrat controlled cities around the country which have, and enforce, the strictest "gun control" laws, such as in the cities of New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. And where do the mass shooting occur? Mass shootings always seem to occur in so called "gun free zones" where according to the law and the sign on the building, no guns are allowed. And so how can it possibly happen that people are getting shot in these designated "safe" gun free zone locations? Could it be maybe that criminals and the criminally minded individuals do not read the sign and also do NOT obey the law? In his

book, *More Guns Less Crime*, by John R. Lott Jr., the author and researcher discloses a very interesting fact. With only one exception, every multiple victim public shooting in this country since at least 1950 in which there was 3 or more victims took place in areas in which guns were not permitted. Now, consider the following experiment. In the city of Kennesaw, Georgia, the local government decades ago passed a gun ordinance. However, this ordinance did not ban guns, it instead required that all heads of households (with only certain exceptions for the disabled and those with a religious objection) keep at least one firearm in their home. And after that regulation went into effect in 1982, crime against persons plummeted 74 percent compared to 1981, and then fell another 45 percent in 1983 compared to 1982... And it continued to stay impressively low. What is even more interesting about Kennesaw is that the city's crime rate decreased with the simple publicized knowledge that the entire community was armed. The bad guys didn't force the residents to prove it. Just knowing that residents were potentially armed prompted them to move on to easier targets. Most criminals are cowards and don't have a death wish and will therefore always select the easier target. Convicts serving time in prison have been interviewed and questioned on this exact topic and all confirmed that they base their decision to proceed to execute a crime when they believe it to be an easy target, but they avoid the danger of what they believe to be a more difficult target. One can find video clips online of attempted armed robberies being committed by small gangs of two or three in public places such as a restaurant. In one of these we see a couple of men rush into the restaurant and acting brave and fierce as they brandish their guns and bark their orders at the patrons in order to scare them into submission. Then far away in the back of the restaurant, we see an old man in shorts who stands up holding a small pocket gun and who begins shooting at the robbers. And instantly, these once brave and bold robbers are tripping over themselves trying to rush to the door to escape the violence being unleashed upon them by an old man using a small caliber pocket pistol. There are also many similar accounts of home break-ins which occurred when the parents had stepped out for a short while. In one such case the children were entrusted to the eldest child, a young 12 year old girl. And upon hearing the noise of some

men attempting to breach their front door, she secured the safety of her younger siblings by having them stay in the bedroom while she, being familiar with shooting her .22 caliber rifle, immediately grabbed her gun and inserted a loaded magazine and chambered the first round. And upon seeing the intruders enter the home she fired multiple shots from her position on the second floor and it was just like in the restaurant, the robbers began tripping over themselves in a rush to exit the property. Today, however, we are seeing that some states, such as California are introducing new laws to make it illegal for one to defend themselves, even from a home invader. Such laws would expect that Americans be compelled by the law to allow criminals to have the run of their house and to let them take whatever they want. This policy of protecting criminals and punishing the law abiding citizens, just like we have seen in European countries, is now what is being pushed on Americans. We hear all the time from antigun zealots about how a gun was once again used to end innocent lives. But never do we hear of the millions of unreported cases where a gun in the hands of a law abiding person saved innocent lives, which happens far more often than those instances of some innocent person being killed by a gun. But if these anti-gun people are really interested in saving innocent lives in volume, why don't they focus on where the larger numbers of lives are lost? For quite some time in the US, well over 200,000 people die at the hands of the medical community from medical mistakes committed by doctors and/or hospital staff... and this is pre-Covid.

40. Although the argument made in this complaint in support of individual gun Rights as expressed in the Second Amendment is not about the use of guns for individual self-defense, it is clear that for the average American, this is an important aspect of this Right to keep and bear arms. Thus it is important for those who strongly disfavor guns in our society to understand that guns, more than any other invention, is what makes our modern society possible as the gun makes us all safer and makes possible the safety we derive from living in a civilized society. Plaintiff herein submits for the court's review a very brief essay entitled, The Gun is Civilization, whose authorship is credited as being by, Maj. L. Caudill USMC (Ret).

The Gun is Civilization

"Human beings only have two ways to deal with one another: reason and force. If you want me to do something for you, you have a choice of either convincing me via argument, or force me to do your bidding under threat of force. Every human interaction falls into one of those two categories, without exception. Reason or force, that's it. In a truly moral and civilized society, people exclusively interact through persuasion. Force has no place as a valid method of social interaction and the only thing that removes force from the menu is the personal firearm, as paradoxical as it may sound to some. When I carry a gun, you cannot deal with me by force. You have to use reason and try to persuade me, because I have a way to negate your threat or employment of force. The gun is the only personal weapon that puts a 100-pound woman on equal footing with a 220-pound mugger, a 75-year old retiree on equal footing with a 19-year old gang banger; and a single guy on equal footing with a carload of drunken guys with baseball bats. The gun removes the disparity in physical strength, size, or numbers between a potential attacker and a defender. There are plenty of people who consider the gun as the source of bad force equations. These are the people who think that we'd be more civilized if all guns were removed from society, because a firearm makes it easier for a [armed] mugger to do his job. That, of course, is only true if the mugger's potential victims are mostly disarmed either by choice or by legislative fiat—it has no validity when most of a mugger's potential marks are armed. People who argue for the banning of arms ask for automatic rule by the young, the strong, and the many, and that's the exact opposite of a civilized society. A mugger, even an armed one, can only make a successful living in a society where the state has granted him a force monopoly. Then there's the argument that the gun makes confrontations lethal that otherwise would only result in injury. This argument is fallacious in several ways. Without guns involved, confrontations are won by the physically superior party inflicting overwhelming injury on the loser. People who think that fists, bats, sticks, or stones don't constitute lethal force are guilty of watching too much TV where people take beatings and come out of it with a bloody lip at worst. The fact that the gun makes lethal force easier works solely in favor of the weaker defender, not

the stronger attacker. If both are armed, the field is level. The gun is the only weapon that is as lethal in the hands of an octogenarian as it is in the hands of a weight lifter. It simply wouldn't work as well as a force equalizer if it wasn't both lethal and easily employable. When I carry a gun, I don't do so because I am looking for a fight, but because I'm looking to be left alone. The gun at my side means that I cannot be forced but instead only persuaded. I don't carry it because I'm afraid, but because it enables me to be unafraid. It doesn't limit the actions of those who would interact with me through reason, only the actions of those who would do so by force. It removes force from the equation... and that's why carrying a gun is a civilized act." - Maj. L. Caudill USMC (Ret).

We have been lied to by those that seek to destroy what America is and what it stands for. There are in fact people in our government who subscribe to and follow the radical teachings of Cloward & Piven and/or who have been greatly influenced by the same and also the likes of Saul Alinsky (*Rules for Radicals*). One of Alinsky's quotes was that; "*The first radical known to man who rebelled against the establishment and did it so effectively that he at least won his own kingdom was Lucifer.*" His writing consisted of how to win at all costs. What Saul Alinsky was trying to say is that political radicals should usurp and destroy the ideals and laws instituted by our country's founders by any and all means. And among those in Washington who are known to have followed his teachings are Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama. The strategy and teachings of these radicals was to destroy the U.S. economy by significantly increasing the number of welfare recipients and to do as much as possible to stress the system in order to bring about a collapse of the financial system to the point where socialism would necessarily be instituted. And to help in carrying this out, it was also important to better control the media. And it was Obama who made it legal for the media to purposefully lie to the American people. In 2012, Obama signed H.R. 4310, which essentially neutralized two previous acts—the Smith-Mundt Act of 1948 and Foreign Relations Authorization Act in 1987, that had been passed to protect U.S. audiences from their own government's misinformation campaigns. This action by Obama allowed for PROPAGANDA to be used on

American citizens by their own government. Many of those in Washington, DC have proven themselves to be puppets of the globalists. And these globalists have a plan for world domination, and they know that their New World Order under a one world government cannot be ushered in while America retains the Constitution and the American people remain a free people with the will and the means to fight. That is the very reason for why they seek to divide us, to demoralize us, and to confuse the issues surrounding our recognized God given Rights in order to continue to erode our Rights and to eventually abolish the government created by our Constitution. We have also been lied to and misled by ignorant people who do not understand that the gun is in fact what makes us all much safer. Just imagine calling 911 to report a violent gang breaking into your home and police respond but are armed with only their Billy club nightsticks and whistles. The banning of guns does NOT eliminate violent crime and homicides. One only needs to look at all the violence happening today in many parts of Europe to see that crime will, and still does, persist without guns. Banning and eliminating of guns from a society only serves to embolden the criminally minded and to leave the innocent without the means to defend themselves. Yet there are cases at this time before the courts (such as *Snope v. Brown*) contesting the actions of certain states that seek to ban all semi-automatic firearms. More cases will soon follow as states like Colorado with their SB25-003 Bill are seeking to ban all semi-automatic firearms, and which would affect the sale and transfer of the great majority of all firearms in existence today. The high court is at this time also getting ready to rule on this question: *Does the Constitution permit a state to ban semiautomatic rifles that are in common use for lawful purposes, including the most popular rifle in America, the AR15?* And of course, that answer should be a resounding NO, as all states must comply and adhere to the "Supreme Law of the Land". Why do these cases even exist?

41. And the truth is that if it were not for the gun, we would all be ruled today by the law of the jungle where the bigger and more powerful among us would rule over the weaker among us. Long before gun powder and firearms were invented, people were being killed by the thousands and even hundreds of thousands. Roaming bands of foreign armies and also marauders would

invade villages and kill, rape and plunder. Then later on, because of the introduction of firearms, people found that they were finally able to defend against such attacks. There can be no doubt that guns have helped to keep us all much safer and free. The problem however is in creating a government and then entrusting it with a monopoly of force by accepting restrictions on individual access to weapons while our government, all the way down to the local police level, get heavily armed with military grade weapons and equipment. The balance of power and force must always remain with the people, because to do otherwise will eventually lead to tyranny. Another mistake is to believe and to accept that the government's law enforcement personnel will always come to protect us when we are in need of such protection. The courts have in fact established that the police are not legally bound to protect citizens. The Supreme Court has ruled that police do NOT have a constitutional duty to protect individuals from harm, even in cases where a person has obtained a court-issued protective order. This means that police are not legally obligated to respond to calls for help or to protect citizens from attackers or other forms of harm. And sure, law enforcement officers often do take an oath to protect the public from serious harm or death, and they are expected to respond to people in need. But despite this, there is no inherent constitutional duty that requires police to prevent every crime or protect individuals from harm. Additionally, when one calls 911, what is the typical response time? More often than not, the police arrive after the event is over and the damage has been done. The police then are basically there to count the casualties and to write up the report and to call it in so the cleanup crew can be sent out. And so, like it or not, we are our own first responders. And once you realize that, you will come to understand the importance of being armed, because sometimes, being armed is the one and only thing that provides you with any chance to survive an encounter with an attacker (whether two or four legged).

GOVERNMENT'S INTENT TO BAN ALL GUNS

42. In a number of countries around the world, there have been governments that have taken actions to ban guns, and this was almost always followed by democide (the killing of a population by their own government). It is beyond clear that guns greatly affect the balance of power. As China's leader once famously said; "*All political power comes from the barrel of a gun. The communist party must command all the guns, that way, no guns can ever be used to command the party.*" - Mao Tze Tung, Nov 6, 1938. Here in America there are a great many examples which can be cited to show that an element has infiltrated and has existed within our US government which seeks to destroy America from within and that these subversives have had as one of their initial goals, the total and complete disarming of the American people. The United Nations is one such group. The UN was also responsible for assisting and promoting the mass invasion of illegal immigrants during the last four years. The UN building in New York has an art work sculpture called "Non Violence" which is in the form of a revolver with its barrel tied in a knot. This kind of thinking is clearly antithetical to the American way of life, as its true intent is to demonize guns so that the public accepts being disarmed, while the government remains fully armed. This promotes a socialist/communist control over a society, and these socialist and communist ideals always eventually end in a high body count. But still today there are many anti-American people holding high positions of power who hold the same beliefs and goals as was expressed in the not too distant past when we heard this from former US Attorney General, Janet Reno; "*Waiting periods are only a step. Registration is only a step. Prohibition of firearms is the goal.*" And then we also heard this from former US Attorney General, Eric Holder; "*We need to brainwash people into thinking about guns in a vastly different way.*" Eric Holder was also the man responsible for the Fast & Furious gun running operation which sold illegal guns to the Mexican drug cartels and as a result, caused the death of a US Border Patrol Agent. So it is clear that the disarming of the American people is, and has been, on the agenda for a long time. And it has also been made clear that psychological methods have been employed in order to turn public opinion against guns. The use of terms such

as “gun violence” to imply that we can blame the inanimate object rather than the individual for the behavior is utterly ridiculous. An evil intent on the part of an individual(s) is behind any and all acts of violence committed regardless of the instrument used. In the classic 1953 Hollywood film, SHANE, the main character played by Alan Ladd put it this way; *“A gun is a tool, Marian; no better or no worse than any other tool: an axe, a shovel or anything. A gun is as good or as bad as the man using it. Remember that.”* - Automobiles have at times been used to ram into large crowds. Also, many more people are killed by automobiles with a drunk driver behind the wheel, and do we ever blame the car and then seek to take the cars away from safe drivers? So-called “gun control” legislation only pretends to control guns when in reality, an inanimate object cannot be controlled via any piece of legislation and thus these laws merely act to place controls on the innocent law abiding citizens as by definition, criminals do NOT obey laws. Furthermore, the FBI publishes data on homicides in America listing the COD and the instrument used. And a review of the FBI’s own data shows that more people are killed every year in the US by blunt force trauma where the instrument used was a common hammer than by all rifles of all makes and models and all calibers combined (of which the AR15 is just one small subset). And so in light of this, should we take to calling a hammer an “assault hammer”? There are clearly a lot of psychological games being played to manipulate the public’s mind. Hence the reason for all the mass shootings in recent decades, of which most all have NOT been organic, but rather, orchestrated events designed to push forth a political agenda. And it seems that, in violation of the First Amendment, we are not being allowed to talk about these events in any way which questions the official narrative. They almost literally crucified Alex Jones for publicly raising doubts about the Sandy Hook shooting, of which there were many unanswered questions. Jones’ case was heard in a Connecticut court where limits were placed on what evidence and testimony the defendant was allowed to present. The result was a loss for Jones who got hit with an obnoxious \$965 Million amount in damages awarded to the families. But these kinds of school mass shootings were unheard of in times of the not so distant past even though the restrictions on guns were much different and almost nonexistent as guns

were much easier to obtain back then. It was not that long ago during the 1960's and 1970's that one could order a gun right out of a Sears & Roebuck catalog and have the gun delivered right to your home. Kids in school participated in target shooting and no one ever got bent out of shape when a kid took his gun to school. But today if a kid in school makes a "finger gun" (a closed fist with his thumb and index finger extended) he gets suspended or expelled from school. In one case, a child was actually suspended because while in the cafeteria and having taken a couple bites from a slice of pizza, the remaining pizza was left in what an overzealous teacher thought resembled a gun. This has only been happening because corrupt anti-American politicians in DC via their control of the public schools systems by the unconstitutional Department of Education are forcing these insane policies in our schools. And this was predicted and told to us by a former Navy Intelligence Officer by the name of William Cooper in his book entitled, Behold a Pale Horse (Dec. 1991). On page 225 of his book, William Cooper wrote the following; *The government encouraged the manufacture and importation of firearms for the criminals to use. This is intended to foster a feeling of insecurity, which would lead the American people to voluntarily disarm themselves by passing laws against firearms. Using drugs and hypnosis on mental patients in a process called Orion, the CIA inculcated the desire in these people to open fire on schoolyards and thus inflame the antigun lobby. This plan is well underway, and so far is working perfectly. The middle class is begging the government to do away with the 2nd Amendment.*

These political tricks that are being played on the ignorant public includes the use of the controlled media to sway public opinion against guns. And just like when the Judas goat leads the sheep to slaughter, the ignorant public are all following and not realizing that in the end, this path that they are on will be the cause of their own enslavement and of their own demise. William Cooper also proved to be very prophetic as he also foretold of the attack on 9/11/2001 ten weeks before it happened. In his 'Hour of the Time' radio broadcast of June 28th 2001, Cooper told his audience that there was going to be a false flag attack on US soil, and he even went so far as to name the scapegoat - Bin Laden. And that 9/11 event was yet another event with a great deal of unanswered

questions that we are not allowed to talk about. Even qualified professionals such as the groups of pilots, architects and engineers and also demolition experts who all have the knowledge and experience to raise good questions, all have been silenced. Liberty is meaningless where the Right to utter one's thoughts and opinions has ceased to exist. That 9/11 event ushered in a whole new level of control and it was all planned out ahead of time as evidenced by the fact that the so-called USA Patriot Act was written years before the events of 9/11 and was just sitting on the shelf waiting to be used as the emergency measure to address the problem of terrorism which the government itself created. They stripped away more of our freedoms and provided the excuse for war. We must never forget the warning left to us by Benjamin Franklin when he said; "*Those who would give up essential Liberty, to purchase a little temporary Safety, deserve neither Liberty nor Safety*".

43. Additionally, the events of 9/11 also helped to usher in a long line of new wars and a great deal of spending, and which certainly seems to have all been planned out well in advance of 9/11 as evidenced by the statements made by General Wesley Clark after visiting the Pentagon just days after 9/11 and hearing of the Pentagon's plans to attack 7 countries in 5 years. And in fact, since 9/11 the US has been involved in a number of military conflicts in various countries, either directly or indirectly. These include: **Afghanistan (2001–2021)** – The War on Terror begins with the invasion of Afghanistan in October 2001. **Iraq (2003–2011)** – The US invasion of Iraq occurred in March 2003, leading to a prolonged military presence until 2011. **Syria (2014–present)** – The US has been involved in the Syrian Civil War, primarily through airstrikes and supporting proxy forces, such as the Syrian Democratic Forces (SDF). **Libya (2011)** – The US participated in NATO-led airstrikes against Libyan forces during the civil war, contributing to the fall of Gaddafi. **Yemen (2015–present)** – The US has supported the Saudi-led coalition in Yemen's civil war, particularly through logistics, intelligence, and arms sales. **Pakistan (2001–present)** – Although not officially at war, the US has conducted numerous drone strikes against Taliban and al-Qaeda targets in Pakistan. **Somalia (2007–present)** – The US has conducted counterterrorism operations in Somalia, primarily against al-Shabaab, and has supported the African Union Mission in Somalia.

(AMISOM). Ukraine (2022–present) – Although the US is not directly fighting Russia, it has provided substantial military aid to Ukraine in its defense against Russia's invasion, and the US has trained Ukrainian forces. Gaza (2023 –present) – Although again the US is not directly fighting in this war, it provides substantial financial and military aid to Israel. The breakdown for each of these individual conflicts is available, however, what is important to see is that, in the 23 years since the attack of 9/11, the United States has spent an estimated **\$4 trillion to \$4.8 trillion** on foreign wars and military operations. This includes direct military spending on wars such as those in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, and others, as well as substantial foreign aid to countries like Ukraine and Israel involved in ongoing conflicts. And in return, what have the American people received for this outrageous expenditure? There has been no quantifiable benefit to the American population. Instead what Americans got was this: Total U.S. military deaths (2001–2021): ~7,000. Total U.S. military injuries resulting in permanent disabilities (2001–2021): ~35,000 to 45,000. Additionally, a high rate of Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI): One of the most significant injuries affecting veterans post 9/11 is traumatic brain injury, which has affected hundreds of thousands of service members. While many of these injuries are less visibly dramatic than amputations or other injuries, TBIs can lead to lifelong cognitive and emotional challenges. And we should not overlook the rate of suicide among today's veteran population which has been averaging an astounding 17 suicide deaths per day in post 9/11 wars translating to around 140,000 veteran suicides from 2001 to the present. And then, to add one of the greatest insults given to our US Military, Former US Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, once basically declared military men to be mere cannon fodder when he said, "*Military men are dumb, stupid animals to be used as pawns for foreign policy*". And this expressed sentiment by Kissinger brings to mind the thoughts of General Smedley Butler, the most decorated Marine in US history, as conveyed in his book, *War is a Racket*, in which Butler summarized that upon reflection, his entire time in the military amounted to working as a mercenary doing the bidding of big business and the globalist leaders to further their self-enrichment goals. Americans deserve better than this. And clearly, the US government has NOT been acting in the best interests of the

American people. And so it is no surprise to see that history has shown to us that any time a commission is formed by the government to look into a major event such as the JFK assassination or 9/11, that its goal is never about conducting a real investigation to get to the truth, but rather, the commission's goal is to provide a cover-up story to placate the public. William Cooper also said this; "*Your government is selling your children drugs, and you don't seem to care. Your own government has given away the power of the people, and you don't seem to care... We are a nation of sheep. And ladies and gentlemen, I assure you that sheep are always led to slaughter. BUT IT DOES NOT HAVE TO BE THIS WAY.*" Later also saying; "*Those of you who are smart enough to know what is transpiring here, know that these are historic broadcasts...And that by making these broadcasts I have sealed my fate.*" William Cooper was later killed on 11/5/2001 by Sheriff's deputies while at his home.

44. For anyone who has had their eyes open, Cooper's words were not new or hard to believe. It was already well known that the CIA had been importing drugs into the US and selling them to the American youth in order to fund their clandestine black operations. And this was also fully exposed back in 1996 during a video recorded town hall meeting which took place on November 15, 1996 in Los Angeles with CIA Director John M. Deutch in attendance. In this meeting, direct allegations of CIA involvement in drug trafficking were made by former LA Police Officer, Mike Ruppert, who stated that he had first-hand knowledge and also clear and undeniable evidence that the federal government through the CIA had been involved for years in illegal drug trafficking throughout the country under certain operations with such names as, Amadeus, Pegasus, and Watchtower. Michael C. Ruppert (1951 – 2014) was a former Los Angeles Police Detective from 1973 to 1978 and had been assigned to handle narcotics investigations in the most dangerous neighborhoods of Los Angeles. He eventually made discoveries that led him to believe he had stumbled onto a large network of narcotics traffickers and that the U.S. government, via certain agencies and also the US Military, as well as the LAPD, were involved. Prior to this 1996 town hall meeting, Michael Ruppert spent 18 years trying to get this information out but was met with

resistance at every turn. He was shot at, and then finally forced out of the LAPD. Michael Ruppert was the first credible source to identify the CIA as a major drug trafficker who was importing billions of dollars in illegal drugs and selling them on the streets of America to fund its clandestine and illegal operations around the world. Ruppert, at this 1996 town hall meeting in Los Angeles, once again offered to provide to all those in attendance representing the federal government or anyone else, the evidence and documentation that he had been maintaining in his possession. The CIA director, John Deutch, told Ruppert to "Go tell the police... don't tell me, I'm only the director of the organization you're trying to hold accountable." John Deutch was soon after forced to leave the CIA in December of 1996. And all of the promises of conducting an investigation into this wrong doing by the government trafficking illegal drugs on America's streets all came to a quick end. Now fast forward to today and we see an epidemic of fentanyl coming across the southern border, together with human trafficking, 100's of thousands of young lives lost to fentanyl and some 350,000 unaccounted for and missing children (and possibly a lot more), and this from just during the last administration. Criminal activity, on this industrial scale, can only happen as a result of those certain entities that are in control of our government allowing it, and wanting to see it happen, and then also participating in and profiting from making it happen. If the government did not truly want to have this happening, it would not be happening. Remember that when the government declared war on poverty, we got more poverty. And when the government declared war on drugs we got more drugs... and even when the war on terror was declared we got more terrorism and forever wars in the Middle East. The terrorist groups like ISIS and Al Qaeda that we are told about have their origins in the intelligence communities of the US, Great Britain and Israel. And more recently, the gangs that arrived here and infiltrated our society such the Tren de Aragua, and MS13 that have been responsible for all manner of crimes including carjacking, rape and murder were allowed, and even, according to Argentina's president Maduro, requested by the Biden administration, to be released from the Argentina prisons so that they could be imported into the US to begin to cause problems in the US. These criminals were allowed to commit their crimes, and if they got caught,

they were quickly released and put back on the street to continue to commit more crimes. If you will remember, even Kamala Harris was involved in raising money for bail to allow these criminals back on the street. This again is in line with following the Cloward-Piven strategy to overburden and stress a society in order to further its decline towards collapse. And according to El Salvador's president, Nayib Bukele, these gangs at some time also adopted the practice of Satanism and ritual human sacrifice which involves the killing of babies. The problems we have today in this country go far deeper than the violence and drug crimes that we see being reported on the news. And so the drugs, child sex trafficking and pedophilia is not even the worse of it. There is a satanic component to all of this which is the underside of the drug trafficking and the human trafficking and child sex slavery and ritual human sacrifice. And because this is also big business and involves a great deal of money, people in high positions who publicly appear to be respectable are also involved. These illegal operations and illegal activities are known about and are also being facilitated by people holding high positions within our US government. In fact, as a further proof of this that one can see, during the war in Afghanistan, even our US soldiers and marines were photographed guarding the poppy fields in Afghanistan. And prior to this war, the Taliban had greatly curbed this activity by the locals. But with the US in Afghanistan, production again went into high gear and our US Military was placed on guard duty to protect the operation. One has to really wonder who is in control of our US Military as they no longer seem to follow the required chain of command. And as another prime example of this, during a US Senate hearing in which the then Secretary of Defense, Leon Panetta, was being questioned, Panetta stated and admitted, and was even made to repeat what he said for clarity when the Senator could not believe what he was hearing as Panetta was forced to make clear that, the US military takes its orders from NATO... and only later advises Congress of its actions and decisions. At all levels of government, the Constitution is not being respected. The US should break away and sever all ties with globalist organizations such as the United Nations and NATO as well as a number of others such as the World Health Organization as their interests are not aligned with those of the American people.

45. Corruption is a growth industry, and the corruption within our government has been growing, and continues to grow, beyond the scale of what the average American can or ever could have possibly imagined. Even now with the efforts being taken by the Trump administration by the DOGE team to expose corruption and waste, this is barely exposing the tip of the iceberg. President Kennedy started USAID as a humanitarian effort, but after he was murdered, the CIA took it over and began the operations which are today being exposed by the DOGE team. The new administration after JFK's death also ended his attempt at giving us an alternative to the Federal Reserve Note which JFK did with his EO 11110 which allowed for the printing of United States Treasury notes which were being issued without interest. There is no doubt that the means by which all of the corruption we see being uncovered today can only be made possible because of the endless amount of fiat currency that comes out of the Federal Reserve and which the Congress regularly taps into. And it's amazing to see our elected officials on the floor of the Congress seemingly expressing their horror and disbelief over the huge waste and fraud being uncovered by DOGE and which is now also being exposed to the public, when we all know that all of this was only made possible because these same elected officials approved of and voted for all of this wasteful spending and grifting. In fact it was Congress who created "The Impoundment Control Act of 1974" which is a U.S. federal law that establishes the procedures for Congress to review and control the executive branch's withholding of budget authority. This act made it possible for the Congress to override the president's decisions or veto on spending cuts and to force the full spending of all of the budget money approved by Congress for a particular project, even if a less expensive way is found to accomplish the same goal. Our government is run intentionally to waste money as every department and agency has an annual budget that if not entirely spent at the end of the fiscal year, that department or agency's budget will get cut in the following year...hence the wild and wasteful spending towards the end of the year in order to not get their budgets cut. Many applications for government grants get submitted towards this time knowing that these agencies must fully spend their entire budget or get their budget cut in the next year. The system is designed

to waste money, and it rewards this waste by increasing the budget the following year. But this is not just wasteful spending with billions upon billions of dollars involved, it is in fact criminal activity on an industrial scale. Additionally, the bills introduced in the Congress are never single item bills but instead are loaded with pork barrel spending. And it's a fact that many of these bills are not even written by the elected officials but rather by the lobbyists that they are beholden to. And as we have seen very often, these bills are not even read before the votes are cast. Obama had promised the American people full transparency, yet when his signature bill, the Affordable Care Act, a/k/a 'Obama Care' was brought up for a vote, no one had read it (including the many Congress members set to vote on it), and the people had not been allowed to see it because as Nancy Pelosi told us; "*We first have to pass the bill before we can see what's inside*". When the American people vote and elect their representatives, we expect that they will represent us... and NOT the lobbyists who constantly have their ear. Is it really any wonder why so many of these "public servants" working for government salaries in short order become millionaires and then also ultra-millionaires worth tens and even hundreds of millions of dollars? The American people do not elect someone to Congress so that they can improve their life, we elect them to Congress to work towards improving our lives, the lives of the American people.

46. As Former Assistant Secretary of HUD, Catherine Austin Fitts, has said and repeated many times; "*The federal government operates as a criminal enterprise.*" Something else she said which also rings very true is; "*Crime that pays is crime that stays*", and it certainly has been with us for a very long time, and the people are now just beginning to learn just how big of a problem this is. The federal government has been a money laundering scheme for politicians for a very long time, and this is really nothing new. Wisconsin had a US Senator by the name of William Proxmire who every year held his Annual Golden Fleece Award in which he highlighted examples of some of the wasteful spending. Back in his day when Proxmire was a US Senator, Proxmire would highlight and tell us of the government having spent tens of thousands of dollars for simple items such as a common hammer or a toilet seat. Now decades later, this fraud and waste is not

just into the billions or hundreds of billions, but rather it has grown into the tens of trillions. On September 10, 2001, the day before 9/11, the then Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld went on national TV telling (or rather confessing) to the American people that the Pentagon had lost or misplaced, and could not account for a missing \$2.3 Trillion Dollars! And then the next day a plane or a missile hit the Pentagon in the exact location where an audit was being conducted to try to locate those missing funds. And of course after that, and with the events of 9/11, that entire story was buried and forgotten. But then also in 2017, a Professor at Michigan State University by the name of Mark Skidmore, put together a team of graduate students to look into government waste and spending and they uncovered that there was another \$21 Trillion of missing money from just two government agencies, the Pentagon and HUD. And to this day, the Pentagon has never passed an audit. Trillions go missing from here and then more Trillions go missing from there and pretty soon we are talking serious money right? But honestly, how much could we have improved America's infrastructure and the lives of the American people with just one of those missing Trillions? And how many more Trillions are missing today?

ANOTHER AMERICAN REVOLUTION IN OUR FUTURE?

47. Understand that Plaintiff is NOT calling for a second American revolution. However, the Founding Fathers were taken to the point of having to take such measures, and it would be in every American's best interest to review this history as well as to examine where America is today in 2025. While most Americans today I'm sure cannot imagine that there could ever be a need to go to war against their own government in another revolution, we must not forget that this country was in fact started by a revolution, and that it is because of the fact that the Founders knew and understood tyranny, that our Constitution was drafted in the way that it was. In the words left to us by their writings, we learn many things about how they felt on the subject of personal freedom, liberty, and tyranny, and of the duty to defend against it. This is what the Father of our Country had to say:

"A free people ought not only be armed and disciplined, but they should have sufficient arms and ammunition to maintain a status of independence from any who might attempt to abuse them, which would include their own government." – George Washington

The Founders also penned these words;

"When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation....

But how pray tell could any people desiring to break free of the political bands that bind them to a tyrannical and oppressive government, how could such a people do so without having access to the arms needed to give them the means by which to engage and to prosecute a war against the oppressive government? Make no mistake about it, this was the principal reason for the incorporation of the Second Amendment into the US Constitution. However, fidelity to the Constitution is NOT what Washington, DC is known for. And how well this government keeps and honors its word is maybe best expressed by this quote from the Indian activist, Russel Means, when he said, *"Every single treaty the Indians made with the U.S. Government was broken by Washington; The U.S. Constitution is the treaty that the American people have with the Federal Government, and it too is now also being broken"*. – Russell Means, Indian activist.

Thomas Jefferson in writing the Declaration of Independence, took pains to argue that the right of revolution was a limited one, in the sense that one could not do this for weak or frivolous reasons (or "light and transient causes"). It was for this reason that he and his colleagues provided such a long list of grievances against the British monarch in order to prove to the world that their reasons

for revolt were serious, longstanding, and many. In essence the grounds for revolution were two: the offending government had to have moved away from the very reason for its being, namely the protection of each individual's life, liberty, and property (unfortunately too vaguely expressed here as "the pursuit of happiness"); and that there is a clear pattern of behavior which proves that there is a "design" to create a despotic government over the people. In spite of these restrictions Jefferson obviously thought both conditions had been satisfied by July 1776 and that this therefore established the right to revolution on the part of the American colonists.

48. Plaintiff cannot say if we may soon reach that point or how close we are to reaching it, but by many indicators, we are getting closer to this point. While the government places a strong emphasis on COG (continuity of government), the American people need to be concerned about their wellbeing and their Right to exist as a free people. Consider how much control the government has over our lives today as we are required in some way or another to obtain the government's permission to do just about everything. Many of the everyday things that we do require us to have a government issued license. Besides recreational activities such as hunting and fishing, we also need a license for most of the occupations that many of us make our living at. In fact in some cases it requires double licensing such as in the case of a new home builder who must first be licensed as a contractor in order to make his product but then cannot sell the product he made without first acquiring a second license for himself as a real estate broker, otherwise he must agree to hire and pay an outside real estate broker to sell the new home that he made. And even if he acquires his own customer, the builder cannot transact the sale himself without having the "proper 2nd license" from the state. The truth is that there is really very little that we are allowed to do today without first obtaining the government's permission via a government issued license. And what is a "license"? Black's Law Dictionary defines a license as, "*permission to act or to do something that would otherwise be illegal or prohibited*". So in other words, everything requiring a license has been declared to be an illegal act by the government and thus special permission is required via a

government issued license. And when and how did the act of getting married, an act that since the beginning of time was always considered to be a "Sacred Covenant" between a man, a woman and God, become an "illegal act"? In order to get married today, the state demands one apply for a license which thus makes the state a party to the contract. And is this how the state assumes ownership of the products of that union, our children? We today can no longer partake of marriage without first obtaining a government issued license. And so what ever happened to the so called separation between Church and State? And even the churches themselves are controlled by the government as most today are chartered as a 501C nonprofit corporations. And the threat of losing that nonprofit status always hangs over them, even though churches never needed the government to endorse their nonprofit status. And as a recent example of the effect this can have, during the Covid pandemic we saw a great many churches towing the line and pushing the official government narrative. However, there does appear to be hope at this time with the return of Donald J. Trump back in the White House and with what appears to be happening with the DOGE team. However, there has not yet been a long enough time to see what will transpire, and to see if the intent and goal to restore the American Republic is real and will succeed. But even if we avoid a second revolution, will we be able to avoid a second civil war? Right now it is looking like those that have been in the positions of power and covertly in control of this country are, or will soon be getting the boot, but will they leave peacefully? They, in the last administration, allowed an army of illegals into the country with many of these being the worse of what other countries had to offer in that they were criminals and dangerous gang members. And then another large group that was allowed to enter the country was made up of young single men of military age from various countries, some already known not to be friendly to the US. And while it can be said that America is a nation of immigrants, there are some people from certain parts of the world that simply cannot or will not assimilate into Western society. These are people that hold very strong religious beliefs and ideas that are not tolerant or accepting of others who are not of the same religion. The radical Muslim want everyone to bow down and accept his god and if not, to then behead you. The radical Zionist

Jew that follows the Talmud beliefs he is God's chosen and therefore has the right to rule over and take advantage of every Goyim or non-Jew which to them are considered no better than animals. Most Americans will accept and befriend anyone from any culture, however, most Americans will also not accept being subordinated or to be looked down upon as an inferior being or species of animal. A prime example of how this ends in disaster is the nation of Sweden which was once a socio-economic model — a utopia ranked high on global happiness indices, with physical and social security. However, since the country opened its doors to immigration, primarily from Muslim countries, without proper filters, the nation has become a symbol of failed integration policies. Sweden is today a war zone with regular bombings, gangs extorting small businesses (hence the bombings when they don't pay). Three out of four murders are committed by migrants. And the incidents of rape has gone up dramatically and with migrants being two thirds of the convicted rapists. The Swedes have gained nothing but negative from the importation of these immigrants. And although not as bad as Sweden, we here in America have experienced some of the same. And these are the kinds of polices that have been pushed on Western countries by the globalists, and who many of our elected members of Congress meet with and dine with and support, and are supported by. But even with all of the corruption and blatant theft of American taxpayer money being exposed by Elon Musk and the DOGE team, which already exceeds what most people could have ever imagined, there are some in Congress such as California Rep. Robert Garcia who want the status quo to remain and has even called for violence to be used to stop the exposure of corruption by the DOGE team. Garcia very recently said the following: "*What I think is really important, and what the American public want, is for us to bring actual weapons to this bar fight, this is an actual fight for democracy, for the future of this country*". Sorry Mr. Garcia, but we have to tell you that what you proclaim is NOT what the overwhelming majority of Americans want. What the American people want is for DOGE to weed out the corruption, waste and theft within the federal government. But one also has to wonder and ask why the media did not freak out about this insane, bizarre and wild comment about bringing "*actual weapons to this bar fight*". Clearly this is another example of how the controlled media

always responds. Had these same words and thoughts been spoken by a Republican, no doubt the media would have immediately jumped on this story and began its attack on the one making such a comment. The threats America faces at this time cannot be minimized. There is not much doubt that if those who have infiltrated our government, together with their globalist handlers, want to create chaos on a large scale, they have the means by which to do so. And even though USAID has been shut down and this has eliminated some of their funding source, it may still be very possible for them to repeat, but on a much larger scale, the rioting, looting and burning that we were made to witness during that 'summer of love' in 2020. And it's infuriating to find out and realize that American taxpayer money helped to fund all of that anti-American commotion and turmoil. But additionally, it has also been said that many parts of the US infrastructure are not well protected and thus our society is susceptible and vulnerable to attacks from these kinds of groups, and then also, by groups that some claim exist as sleeper cells of illegal migrant terrorists located all across the country which the Biden administration allowed, and even assisted, in coming to our shores.

But yet another important consideration is also where we are today and how far our government has taken us from the ideals and principles that this country was founded on. Our representatives in Congress are constantly heard saying that America is a democracy when the truth is that our Founders abhorred democracies because they knew that this type of government was too easy to morph into tyranny by some group getting control of the mob which they could then use to force their will on the rest of the population. And of course this illusion of democracy and doing "the will of the people" is much easier to do today with the control of the media which we have seen has been interfering in our elections and has also helped to cover up the fact that our elections have been rigged for some time now, especially with the help from electronic voting machines, which were exposed years ago during hearings in Congress with experts testifying and demonstrating how easy it was to flip the vote count. Additionally, the provisions of the 14th Amendment have been perverted and bastardized in expanding personhood rights to corporations. And after the case of Citizens United v FEC in 2010, corporations and unions are allowed to spend unlimited amounts

on independent expenditures, which include communications that advocate for or against a candidate. And with their huge budgets, corporations can far outspend even collective groups of citizens and thus can have a greater influence on the outcome of elections. Democracy and protecting our democracy and helping to spread democracy around the world is what we hear from the corrupt government officials and their controlled media. Yet, the US has many times acted to overthrow democratically elected leaders in foreign countries in order to install one of their own puppets who would do the bidding of the cabal that has infiltrated our US government. Today these corrupt officials scream about the US having to support the corrupt government of Ukraine and its president who the US helped get installed, and who today, operates a major criminal enterprise out of Ukraine involved in drugs, child trafficking and worse. Zelensky cancelled his country's elections, and is in fact a dictator, and one with a Nazi force behind him. The US fought a war to defeat Nazis in World War II and now today we support and fund Nazis in Ukraine, identified as the Azov Battalion. Ukraine's president, Zelensky, instigated this losing war with Russia and also took conscription to a whole new level by engaging in the kidnapping of young Ukrainian men who are were then given a rifle and sent to the front lines to fight against a well-trained Russian military. And this is how so many of our US government officials see the US as being involved in "spreading democracy" around the world. The truth is that every such act has behind it a profit motive. And now we also come to find out that Ukraine sold huge quantities of American weapons which it had acquired from the US on the international black market at well below market value and with some of the buyers being Mexican drug cartels, Hamas, and the forces now in control of Syria and maybe other armed groups around the world. These buyers are NOT the kind of people we want to see get more heavily armed, but the US has indirectly armed these violent groups, and US taxpayers paid for it! And also, something even scarier, who knows for sure what has happened to what was in all of those bioweapons labs that were discovered in Ukraine. Additionally, we also now hear from Zelensky himself that 58% of the money the US sent to Ukraine disappeared and cannot be accounted for. Our US government literally believes it has money enough to burn and throw away!

49. Those Left leaning politicians in Congress are constantly heard mentioning "our US democracy" and ranting about how the US needs to spread and defend democracy around the world as a way to encourage providing support to countries like Ukraine, and which in fact has a dictator for a leader. But our US government was never intended to be a democracy, but rather, a constitutional republic where individual rights were to be respected and not infringed upon. But because our corrupt US government leaders have aligned themselves with globalist elites, such as those from the United Nations, the World Economic Forum and other NGO's who have as their goal and agenda, world dominance under a totalitarian one world government, in recent years we have seen and heard about their plans for the coming "4th industrial revolution" and the rise of the cashless society and of Fifteen Minute Cities that would basically have us all living in open air prisons. As head of the WEF, Klaus Schwab, has told the world, "*You will own nothing and you will be happy*". However, this country was founded on the principle of individual freedom and individual property ownership, however already today we are far removed from that. Instead of real ownership, what we have today is a "beneficial interest" in what we think we own, but in reality we do NOT have any true legal ownership. We don't even own our labor as the government today is the one who gets to decide how much of the money that we earn from our labor we are allowed to keep. The American people in reality do not own anything, not our homes, not our automobiles, our money in the bank, or our stocks and bonds as these are held in custodial accounts and we are merely given a "beneficiary interest", but not true title. In fact, not even our children can we claim as being truly ours as they too can be legally be taken from us. One can say that they own their home, but do you really own it? Real estate today is transferred via a deed, but a deed is not title but rather only evidence of conveyance and what is being conveyed today to the "new owner" is a "fee simple estate" which Black's Law Dictionary defines as a "form of tenancy" stemming from the old feudal days of kings and lords. Hence the reason for why you have perpetual property taxes (rent) that you must forever pay and which the government solely decides how much tax you must pay... even if the property/home no longer exists. In hurricane ravished North Carolina for example,

hurricane victims will most likely still be sent a property tax bill. The same will be true for those in California who lost their homes in the highly questionable recent fires. And consider this, even if the government can make a claim of owning the land, and assess you a tax on the land's value, how is that they can also claim ownership to the improvements and the structure erected on the land (your home) when the government had no financial participation in building it? And as for your automobile, the original true title is the Manufacturer's Statement of Origin (MSO) which state's laws today require be turned over to the state as part of the required registration of the automobile, where upon the state then gives you a receipt in the form of a "Certificate of Title". But real ownership no longer resides with you and thus for any number of reasons, your vehicle can be impounded and permanently seized... and without any due process! And then also, as we have seen, today the Feds and our local law enforcement operate as land pirates under the highly unconstitutional "asset forfeiture" laws that were put in place and which allow them to legally steal your money and any other assets found on you simply on the basis that they believe you were intending to commit a crime with this cash or other valuable assets they found you to be carrying during your travels. They cannot conceive of the notion that maybe one has a legitimate reason to be carrying cash, such as being a business person out to buy a used piece of equipment from a private party who is a stranger to you and not in your area and who will only do business with you on a cash basis as he does not know you and therefore would never accept your check. Additionally, the money you deposit in the bank is also no longer your money because under today's laws (passed by our "good" people in Congress), once money is deposited and turned over to the bank, it legally belongs to the bank and you are merely an unsecured creditor, and worse, one with subordinate priority. In the event of a bank default, under today's laws, other creditors such as holders of junk derivatives paper, which is now estimated to be in the quadrillions of dollars, have a higher priority and will be paid before any depositors... again, thanks to our "good" people in Congress. And forget about FDIC as it is well known they do not have the funds needed to cover any reasonable number of the banks already known today to be in trouble. Banks today get to

gamble with deposited money and when they win, they get to keep all the profit. But when they lose, then the government steps in to bail them out. There can be no doubt that the banking laws and regulations have been written to favor the banks. This is especially noticeable in the case of when one borrows money for a home purchase and accepts a mortgage loan from the bank. The interest expense charged on the loan is calculated using the "rule of 78" which front end loads the loan such that in the early part of the loan's term, very little of the payment goes toward the principal balance as the great majority of the payment is credited to the interest being charged. It is not until some years have passed that a larger portion of your payment begins to pay down the balance on the loan. Hence the reason for why the banks like to offer customers a new refinance loan and entices them with lower payments which arise most often by resetting the loan's term. But even if there is a savings because of a lower interest rate, the resetting of the loan also resets the interest payment calculation using the rule of 78 and once again, the majority of your payment is interest is credited to the interest expense and not the principal. Also, if you are refinancing to take money out to be used to pay off credit card debt (which is what banks encourage you to do), you are putting more debt on your home which because it is a secured loan, in case of default would cause you to lose the home. And so you are making the trade of adding more debt to your home in order to have the "benefit" of paying off unsecured credit card debt which if you were to default on would not result in you losing any real asset, the worse that could happen would be to receive a negative mark on your credit rating, and which eventually disappears. Your home on the other hand is the collateral for the home loan and the home will be lost upon default of the loan. And another example of how the banks have received extremely favorable treatment from our law makers, consider the purpose of collateral, which is to secure a loan and to guarantee to the lender the repayment of the loan's outstanding balance. But should the lender ever be entitled to receive more than the amount of the outstanding balance on the loan? The answer should be no. However, this is often the case in a foreclosure because the bank takes the property and sells it at a Sheriff's auction and the entire proceeds of the sale belongs to the bank. Consider that if your home was worth \$500,000 and your

mortgage balance was \$200,000 and the bank foreclosed, and the auction sales price brought in \$400,000, the fair thing to do would be for the bank to take the \$200,000 it is owed and to return the other \$200,000 to the foreclosed homeowner. However, that is not what happens, the bank keeps the entire sales proceeds of \$400,000. This was how so many small farmers lost their homes, farms and land during the Great Depression. And basically the same thing happens in a property tax foreclosure. But should the auction sales price not bring in enough to fully satisfy the outstanding loan balance, the bank has the legal right to pursue a deficiency judgment against the foreclosed homeowner to collect the remaining unpaid balance... the law very much favors the banks! But do banks really have a lawfully legal right to foreclose, and in the manner that they do it? According to the Federal Reserve's own publication entitled, Modern Money Mechanics, in which the Fed Bank tells how banks create money out of thin air, it can be argued that the banks in making loans, fail to meet the requirement of having put up any "consideration", which is a requirement in order for a contract to be legally recognized and binding. In the 1968 foreclosure case, First National Bank of Montgomery v. Jerome Daly, also commonly known as the Credit River Case, defendant Jerome Daly successfully fought his foreclosure using this exact argument. It is not hard to see that in the United States, the legislation that the US Congress passes very often favors the big institutions such as the banks. Now as for what was mentioned regarding your family's children, a judge can legally terminate your parental rights, even without any real justification. In an older episode of the CBS TV show, 60 Minutes, the story was highlighted of a pastor and his wife who had two young children, one a toddler and the other just starting school. Learning to ride a bicycle, the older child suffered a bruise on his leg. An overzealous teacher reported this bruising to Child Protective Services who then went to the home and removed both children from the home and had them placed in foster care. It took close to three years before the parents were exonerated and cleared of any wrong doing or child abuse (which they were never guilty of to begin with). But by this time, the foster parents had developed an attachment and a desire to keep the children and fought for custody. The judge in making his decision said that because these children were so young when

placed into foster care, the foster parents are now the only family the children today know, and so, it would be too disruptive and traumatic for them to be removed from the only home they know...and therefore, the judge ruled that, "in the best interest of the children" the parental rights of the biological parents were to be permanently terminated! Understand, that these are the kinds of things that are happening today in America, the land of the free. And what has made it more disturbing today is that we are learning that many of these government, and also private, agencies and organizations that assert that they are all about protecting children are in fact involved in and/or are facilitating child trafficking. How many nonprofit foundations and NGO's and religious organizations that supposedly were in existence to provide for the welfare of children have we now come to find were actually involved in child trafficking... and receiving taxpayer money from USAID? And USAID is only one agency, and probably not the biggest agency as there certainly are other agencies with possibly larger budgets that have also been laundering billions of dollars for a great many years. But is it any wonder that the former head of USAID, Samantha Power, got wealthier running this USAID money laundering operation to the tune of adding another \$23 Million to her net worth in just 4 years? Why the US doles out so much foreign aid has always been hard to understand, especially when at the same time, the US ignores the needs of its own citizens. During the 1960's space race to be the first country to put a man on the moon, a cartoonist put out a cartoon showing two men looking up at the moon and the one said to the other; "*Well, we may not be the first to put a man on the moon, but I bet we'll be the first to send it foreign aid*". And it has only gotten worse since then. It also has been known for a long time that many of the nonprofit foundations, especially those setup by wealthy elites, are involved in nefarious activities for profit. Norman Dodd in the 1950's was the chief investigator for the Special Committee on Tax Exempt Foundations, chaired by U.S. Congressman B. Carroll Reece in 1953. This committee was tasked with investigating whether tax-exempt organizations were using their funds for un-American and subversive activities, including political purposes, propaganda, or attempts to influence legislation. Dodd's investigation uncovered that some of the major foundations, such as the Carnegie

Endowment for International Peace, Ford Foundation, and Rockefeller Foundation, were involved in instigating the United States into World War I and attempting to control the education system in the United States. Dodd's findings suggested that these foundations were working in harmony to mold American history through the explicit control of education. Researcher and author, G. Edward Griffin, interviewed and video recorded Norman Dodd some time much later and before Dodd passed away in order to preserve Dodd's story and his account of what he uncovered. DOGE today is helping to expose a level of corruption that is on an industrial scale, but also, DOGE is also proving what the Founding Fathers warned about with regards to not allowing the government to usurp power and to expand on its own beyond the limits established by the Constitution. There are way too many aspects of today's US government in departments and bureaucratic agencies that fall outside the 18 enumerated grants of authority in the Constitution. The American people today are in fact being ruled by unelected bureaucrats. And thus it is true that the people must at all times work to constrain the government and keep it bound by the limits of the Constitution.

50. The philosopher and writer, Ayn Rand, seemed to have an insight into the future when in 1905 she wrote these words; "*When you see that trading is done, not by consent, but by compulsion - when you see that in order to produce, you need to obtain permission from men who produce nothing - when you see that money is flowing to those who deal, not in goods, but in favors - when you see that men get richer by graft and by pull than by work, and your laws don't protect you against them, but protect them against you - when you see corruption being rewarded and honesty becoming a self-sacrifice - you may know that your society is doomed.*" –Ayn Rand

Americans work today and try to survive on what the government allows them to keep after being forced to pay all the taxes imposed on them. And if one adds up all the taxes one is subjected to and forced to pay which would include, federal income tax, state income tax, withholding tax, sales tax, property taxes, licenses and fees for everything from your occupation license, driver's license and car registration, gasoline tax, hunting & fishing licenses etc., etc., the average American

pays out about 50% of their earning to the government. Medieval serfs paid considerably less and they were considered slaves. And the only times a serf was made to pay a higher tax rate that approaches what Americans are paying today was during times of war. And if losing 50% of one's earnings in direct taxation was not bad enough, the government further robs the people by the inflation it creates which has robbed 98% of the dollar's purchasing power since the creation of the (not so) Federal Reserve Bank in 1913. And what makes this all so much worse is in seeing how the government spends this money and also seeing the enormous fraud behind so much it.

51. Everyone is told from early on that they must get a Social Security number (SSN). In fact today, one cannot leave the hospital with a new born baby until all the documents have been filled out and signed for a birth certificate and a SSN. And as we know, one cannot open a bank account, or get a driver's license or buy an insurance policy without having this SSN. However, the actual real truth that is kept from us is that there is in fact no law that requires anyone to have an SSN to live or work in the United States. Plaintiff has a copy of a letter from the Social Security Administration signed by the Associate Commissioner in which he states, "*The Social Security Act does not require a person to have a Social Security number (SSN) to live and work in the United States, nor does it require an SSN simply for the purpose of having one. However, if someone works without an SSN, we cannot properly credit the earning for the work performed.*" – This fact, that there is no law requiring anyone to apply for and obtain an SSN has been confirmed. Plaintiff and every other American was fraudulently misled into believing that one was legally required to obtain an SSN. Additionally, this universal identifier has been grossly misused and abused. Social Security cards originally, and for a long time, had a very clear statement on the back side which said; "Not to be used for identification purposes". But of course that changed and furthermore, the government made sure that life was made difficult for anyone trying to exist in the United States without an SSN, and also, that everyone was forced to disclose it to others as a form of identification, as otherwise, they would find it very difficult to interact with banks and other institutions, as well as with employers, due to the government imposed controls and/or coercion

placed on these institutions and businesses to require an SSN of their customers and employees. This is a blatant case of fraud in more ways than one, and as we know, fraud vitiates everything it touches. We hear many politicians, especially the democrats, incorrectly refer to Social Security as being "an entitlement", however, the truth is that both Social Security and Medicare are legally binding obligations of the federal government. Americans were at first told that they would have an account with the Social Security Administration and that this money was to be safely entrusted and maintained in a trust fund with the Social Security Administration acting in the capacity of a fiduciary, and would then later be able to access this money in their account via benefits paid out to them upon reaching their retirement age. However, today over the many years and decades since the passing of the Social Security Act, the Social Security Fund has been allowed to be raided countless times and the money used for other purposes and with the "borrowed" funds never being replaced. Additionally, the system was opened up to allow many other persons who never contributed anything into the fund to also receive SS benefits (with the illegal immigrants that have been recently allowed to enter the country being just the latest pool of beneficiaries). And then also, the program was later expanded to include disability payments which were originally not part of the SSA package. In fact, just recently, a whistleblower told of how she was involved working in the processing of illegal immigrants and had been instructed to ask them questions which could in any way allow for them to get qualified to receive SS disability payments. The whistleblower states that many of these illegals got qualified for disability and that under the system, this status was permanent and therefore, these illegals were being given a lifetime income and being setup for life. This whistleblower continued, adding that now being referred to as "clients", these illegals in many cases were also processed to then receive a US passport. And furthermore, as we are learning today as a result of DOGE, people supposedly over the age of 140 and 150 and even older remain active on the SS list and continue to be sent benefit payments. In other words, a great deal of fraud has been, and continues to be, committed by the people running this agency. And for some time we have been hearing that the Social Security Trust Fund is broke and that the only way benefit

payments are able to be sent out is by using the money being paid into the Fund by the younger working generation, and which is a diminishing population... and so now what we basically have amounts to a Ponzi scheme that will dry up and go bust once enough of the younger generation ceases to pay into the Fund. This is a clear case of fraud which has been committed on Plaintiff and the rest of the American people by the government of the United States, as well as also being a breach of fiduciary duty. These constitute criminal acts for which those in government must pay. Plaintiff has tried contacting Social Security Administration to correct mistakes in their calculation of benefit payouts to Plaintiff, but just as in the case of the ATF, this agency too is also non responsive. But here is the real sore spot for a great many retirees, the government took our dollars when they were still worth something and today is returning to us, dollars that have very little value due to the inflation that the government is solely responsible for creating. In earlier years and up through the 1960's and even into early 1970's a person could dine out and eat a full meal for far less than a dollar. Prices at a local diner could still be found at about \$0.35. McDonald's TV ads told us to bring a friend to McDonald's and both could eat for a dollar and even receive change back. This was possible because a hamburger was 15 cents, and an order of fries was 12 cents. And their competitor, Burger Chef, also ran similar TV ads announcing their triple, consisting of a hamburger, fries and soft drink for only \$0.35. These were the dollars you the government took from us, and now you return to us what is almost worthless paper. Since the Federal Reserve Act was passed in 1913, the US Fed dollar has lost over 98% of its value in terms of its purchasing power when comparing to what a dollar could buy in 1913 and what one dollar will buy of those same goods and services today. We regularly hear arguments over having to raise the minimum wage, but there would be no need to have to raise the minimum wage if the government did not devalue our currency with inflation or if everyone got paid in real money such as gold or silver or a certificate exchangeable for the metal. Consider that in 1964 the minimum wage was \$1.25 and that amount could be held in your hand in the form of five 90% silver quarters (totaling \$1.25) and that those five quarters have a melt value today of \$23.34 (and this is with a rigged controlled

metals market which suppresses prices). The problem of inflation stems directly from fiat currency being printed by the central bank and backed by nothing combined with the government's insatiable appetite for spending and borrowing. And this act by the Congress in 1913 of allowing yet another private central bank into the US for the third time was another example of a betrayal and of the "selling out" against the interests of the American people by the US Congress in their taking a clearly unconstitutional action in allowing the US Congress to delegate the government's power to coin and print its own currency and to give it to a private group of bankers. Did we not learn anything from the experiences of the previous two private central banks that the US had in its earlier history? And why have we never listened and paid attention to these parasites when they openly and very clearly stated and telegraphed their intentions such as when the founder of the Rothschild banking dynasty, Mayer Amschel Rothschild, said; "*Allow me to issue and control a country's currency and I care not who makes its laws*". And Josiah Stamp who also famously said, "*Bankers own the earth. Take it away from them, but leave them the power to create money and control credit, and with a flick of a pen they will create enough to buy it all back.*" This is the reason why the Founding Fathers hated and distrusted central bankers. Thomas Jefferson also tried to warn us when he said; "*If the American people ever allow private banks to control the issue of their currency first by inflation then by deflation the banks and corporations that will grow up around them will deprive the people of all property until their children wake up homeless on the continent their Fathers conquered... I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies... The issuing power should be taken from the banks and restored to the people to whom it properly belongs.*" And even the automobile manufacturer, Henry Ford, had something to say on this subject and left us with this quote; "*It is well enough that people of the nation do not understand our banking and monetary system, for if they did, I believe there would be a revolution before tomorrow morning.*" In November 2002, at a social dinner, Ben Bernanke, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank delivered a speech where he apologized for the Fed's role in causing the Great Depression of the 1930s. He stated, "*I would like to say to Milton [Friedman] and Anna [Schwartz]: Regarding the*

Great Depression. You're right, we did it. We're very sorry. But thanks to you, we won't do it again."

And during a July 18, 2012 Senate Hearing in which Ben Bernanke was asked by Senator Ron Paul if gold was money, Bernanke's answer was an astounding no. Bernanke argued that gold was not money in the modern economy and that it was more of a commodity, while also stating that the U.S. no longer uses gold as a standard for money. However, Bernanke's statement could not have been more wrong as per our Constitution, gold and silver are the only real money. But today we are also left wondering if the gold in Fort Knox is really there. But then also, who does that gold really belong to? In 1933, via an executive order (edict), FDR confiscated the gold from the American people and also made it illegal for Americans to own gold as a store of wealth. The government offered a fixed price of \$20.67 per ounce for the gold, but once it was in government hands, the gold's price was revalued to \$35 per ounce. This was a clear act of theft and a violation of the Fifth Amendment regarding the taking of private property without just compensation. This action also represented the largest transfer of wealth from private individuals to the government. There is not much doubt that the confiscated gold taken from the American people was melted down and reformed into bars that was then stored at Fort Knox. And with today's cumulative inflation, how much is that gold that was taken from Americans in 1933 worth today? And there may yet have been still another theft. In 2010, China made claims that it had received fake gold bars from the United States, which were allegedly traced back to Fort Knox. The gold bars were found to have been gold-plated tungsten, meaning they were not solid gold, but tungsten bars coated with a thin layer of gold. This issue arose in the context of a trade settlement between China and the U.S., where China allegedly received these bars as part of an international transaction, but only to later discover that they were fraudulent. The American people, with the help of a few members of Congress, have been asking for, and demanding, an audit of both the Federal Reserve Bank and Fort Knox. But for many years and many decades, the American people have been denied this information that the American people are certainly entitled to and which directly impacts the wellbeing of the American economy. Such is this "servant" government that we have today!

52. It has been said that there are two ways to conquer and enslave a nation, one is by the sword, and the other is by debt. Unlike before the creation of the Federal Reserve Central Bank, the government today borrows money at interest, paying this interest to this private central bank, and accumulating a national debt that has become so burdensome that the US today pays over \$1.2 Trillion Dollars a year just in interest expense on the almost \$37 Trillion Dollars of federal debt that the US has today, and which continues to rise exponentially. Most people cannot even wrap their minds around how much a trillion is and do not understand just how big a number is represented by a trillion, yet the government today spends money, and also loses and misplaces money in the trillions of dollars! This is completely unbelievable and totally unacceptable! And it is no coincidence that in the same year of 1913 both the Federal Reserve Act and the Income Tax, via the 16th Amendment, were passed as the two work hand in hand. The massive inflation that they knew would be created by the printing of fiat currency had to have a way of being at least partially concealed from the public, and taking money from the American people before they receive their paycheck so that they never see it is one way to accomplish this. The other is by the massive waste and theft. These two combined removes from the economy a considerable amount of the money being printed such that this missing money is not out there circulating in the economy and competing for goods and services which would further add to the inflation. Also, getting us to apply for the SSN was a way to get us to volunteer and become enrolled and to also be labeled as "taxpayers". Over the years a number of members of Congress and also several IRS Commissioners have openly admitted that the income tax is a voluntary tax. In fact, soon after the 16th Amendment, which can be argued was never successfully ratified, a case came before the US Supreme Court in the matter of STANTON v. BALTIC MINING CO, 240 U.S. 103 (1916) which resulted in the court issuing this ruling; "*the 16th Amendment conferred no new power of taxation*". And so is it really a "lawful" tax? But then also, if one who is supposedly required to file a tax return can only do so by first obtaining and having a Social Security number and, if the law is clear that the Social Security Act does not require any person to have a SSN to live and work in the United

States, how can one be lawfully compelled to comply with the IRS's income tax filing requirements? The entire system is corrupt in more ways than one. The withholding tax taken from us before we receive our paycheck came about as a result of World War II. It was called the "Victory Tax" and it was a withholding tax enacted during the war to address the increased cost of the war and to ensure a steady flow of revenue into the U.S. Treasury. It was introduced as part of the Revenue Act of 1942, which was passed on October 21, 1942. The purpose of the Victory Tax was to broaden the tax base and ensure that almost every American worker contributed to the war effort through their taxes. However, prior to this act, only about five percent of American workers paid income tax. But by the end of the war, about 90 percent of American workers submitted income tax forms, and 60 percent paid taxes on their income. The Victory Tax was designed to be a mass tax, requiring employers to withhold money from employees' paychecks to ease the burden of paying a large sum once a year and to create a regular flow of revenue. It was a 5% tax on all individual incomes over \$624. The Victory Tax was implemented only for the duration of the war and it ended with the conclusion of World War II in 1945... However, the government NEVER really publicized this fact to make it known to the people that the need for this Victory Tax had ended and they continued with the withholding aspect of it.

53. From what was just stated above, we can clearly see that the 16th Amendment which took effect in 1913 did NOT result in creating a liability for Americans to pay an income tax and that there was no roll out of any new income tax after this amendment took effect in 1913, as only 5% of Americans paid any income tax all the way up until after World War II was in progress and the Victory Tax (a temporary measure) was passed in October of 1942 to raise money for the war via the withholding tax. But the government saw the opportunity to keep the gravy train rolling and continued the withholding tax by coercing employers to continue withholding from employee's pay and to also strictly follow their fiat requirement for every employee to have an SSN. The American people submitted to all of this because they were being conditioned to comply and to not question any of it. And the media helped by regularly telling us via entertainment and sensationalized news

stories that if one does not comply and pay “their fair share” of income tax, that IRS will hunt you down and crucify you. However, even people within the IRS later came to discover that there is no law that requires one to file a 1040 and to pay an income tax. There have been a number of IRS agents that have come forward with this information, and one such case is that of Joe Banister who was an enforcement agent with the IRS, and who while looking into and investigating tax protestors, got exposed to some of this information regarding there being no law that requires the average person to file a return or to pay an income tax, and he took it upon himself to look into it further in order to dispel that myth. However, after his thorough review of the matter, he reported his findings along with further questions to his superiors, after which he was promptly fired for what he had uncovered and brought to the attention of his superiors at the IRS. So, as a CPA, Banister went back to practice in his accounting business and also began helping clients who did not want to pay any income tax, and who also sought a refund of all prior tax paid in the past. And then of course the government very aggressively went after Joe Banister for engaging in this activity... However, Joe Banister fought his case in court and won his case against the IRS! Robert Bernhoft, Banister’s attorney, said his client was acquitted because the government did not prove he intended to defraud. Observers said a crucial moment of the trial occurred when defense attorneys intensely questioned Banister’s former supervisor at IRS, Robert Gorini, and he was unable to cite any U.S. law that required Banister to pay income taxes. While the case file is being kept hidden, one can see evidence of this at the Bernhoft Law Firm website, <https://www.bernhoftlaw.com/cases/joseph-banister/>, and also at Laughlin v. Commissioner, 117 F. Supp. 2d 997 (S.D. Cal. 2000).

54. The enforcement of the income tax by the IRS is also very unfairly administered and also very often times brutal. The IRS seeks to force compliance with the “requirement” to pay an income tax by the use of fear. Plaintiff has personally seen where the IRS going after a small business for taxes owed has shut down and forced the closure of the business instead of making an arrangement with the business owner to pay his debt over time. The IRS values more the effect of shutting down a small business and placing their sign on the door stating that the business has

been shut down by the IRS because in their mind, this serves to put the fear into others that the same might happen to them should they choose not to comply with the IRS's regulations. The IRS believes it derives more value from doing this than from actually collecting the tax that is due. Additionally, penalties are assessed unfairly and in ways that do not make sense. A self-employed person, such as Plaintiff was for some time, is required to file a quarterly estimate and submit a payment for the tax expected to be due based on the projected income at year's end and which must include the self-employment penalty tax of 15.3%. And should these estimates be deemed to have been low by the IRS, the self-employed person will incur a fine, EVEN THOUGH THE TAX ITSELF IS NOT EVEN DUE UNTIL THE FOLLOWING YEAR ON APRIL 15th! The IRS also files liens and attaches assets, including bank accounts, without any due process. Additionally, when one tries to contest the actions of the IRS, one is limited to having their grievances heard in an IRS administrative court where this agency gets to have full and complete control over the process. Their administrative court decides what evidence and witness testimony will be allowed to be heard, thereby, controlling the outcome of the trial. These actions clearly violate the citizens Right to substantive due process. And these are just a couple of examples of how the IRS mistreats the American people as they trample over the Constitution and violate the Rights of the American people. The truth is that the government is not as interested in collecting tax revenue as they are in controlling the lives of the American people. And this point was driven home by the well-known economist, Milton Friedman who wrote a book called "Free to Choose" which was also made into a TV special which aired on PBS. During Friedman's presentation he went over the calculations of how with a flat tax of about 12%, Americans would pay far less in tax than under the current system, and also, the government would actually collect more in total tax revenue. And so the obvious question was, why doesn't the government do this? And the answer was that the government much prefers the current system whereby they can manipulate and control the people with tax incentives and deductions to move them in one direction using tax incentives and deductions, but then also be able to move them in the other direction with tax penalties and the loss of deductions. It's all

about the government having the ability to exert its control over the population. This is also why the federal government began its federal revenue sharing programs which provides federal funding to the states, thereby creating the state's dependency on these federal funds, and which then provides the federal government with the leverage it needs to exert control over the states via the promise of giving the states money or by the withholding of these funds. But wanting this control over the states and the people are certainly not the actions of a servant government!

55. Also, another issue to consider regarding the income tax payments made to the IRS is, where exactly do those payments made to the IRS wind up, and why is your check for the payment of income tax not made payable directly to the US Treasury? The Grace Commission Report, established under President Reagan, concluded that all individual income tax revenues were absorbed solely by interest on the federal debt and by federal government contributions to transfer payments. Specifically, the report stated that, "*100% of what is collected is absorbed solely by interest on the Federal Debt ... all individual income tax revenues are gone before one nickel is spent on the services that taxpayers expect from their government.*" And understand that when Reagan took office in 1981, the national debt was around \$1 Trillion. And when Reagan left office in 1989, it was at about \$2.6 Trillion. And so, how much worse can all of this be today now that we have a current national debt of \$37 Trillion? Ron Paul put it simply in this way; "*When I say cut taxes, I don't mean fiddle with the code. I mean abolish the income tax and the IRS, and replace them with nothing!*" – Ron Paul.

A review of what has transpired in recent years and an examination of where we are today as a country makes it clear that America needs to make a drastic change in its course and that if not, the American dream will cease to exist. In fact, over the years of our American history, we have been moved much closer to communism than what most people realize. During the Cold War, as kids we were taught the fear of communism. However, a review of Karl Marx's Ten Planks of the Communist Manifesto shows that the US has implemented all ten planks here in America, just under a different name, but with the exact same goal. The elimination of private land ownership, a

progressive income tax, government controlled schools, control of the means of communication and even the abolishment of inheritance with our estate tax. Just compare the list and you will find that all 10 planks exist right here in America today. Additionally, many people were awakened to the reality of where this country was being taken to with the government's actions during the Covid pandemic. It is beyond clear that the manufactured Covid pandemic was an exercise to test how well the people could be controlled and be made to respond to the dictates of the government, and with the side benefit (to the globalists) of pushing forward their transhumanism and depopulation agendas. When we first heard Yuval Noah Harari, the advisor to Klaus Schwab from the World Economic Forum say that, "*Humans are now hackable animals*", some were not sure what that meant. However, now we see what some of this new technology is designed and intended to do. The government's DARPA program is involved in many questionable activities. Among these are the activities and projects of Dr. James Giordano, PhD, a neuroscientist at DARPA who in his recorded video presentations at West Point Academy tells of how "the battlefield of the future is the brain". Dr. Giordano's work is making possible the control of humans via self-assembling nanoparticles which can be injected via vaccine OR also via aerosolization which are then inhaled. This technology allows for the remote control of humans as their thoughts, beliefs and actions can all be greatly influenced. One has to wonder if some of this technology was also in the rollout of the so-called Covid vaccine. Because of people like Dr. David Martin, PhD, who has done extensive research on the origins of Covid and the creation (and funding for) the so-called Covid vaccine, we now know the truth that this was a planned operation and that the initial work was performed here in the US and then outsourced to China in order to get around the restriction on "gain of function" research. This work on gain of function was started in 2015 during the Obama administration. We also now know with certainty that this was in fact part of a depopulation agenda. Dr. Martin uncovered a great deal of highly incriminating evidence during his research and investigations into Covid and the so-called Covid vaccine. And Dr. Martin does not make allegations, instead, using their own words from their own documents and patent filings, Dr. Martin accuses them of creating

an engineered bioweapon, and with one of the stated purposes being for depopulation, while also generating enormous profits for themselves. Everything we were told about Covid and the mRNA vaccine was a lie. It was never a vaccine as per the definition and thus they had to change the definition of a vaccine in order to call it one. And it was never "safe & effective" as they were well aware of the very dangerous side effects. In fact, even the FDA in putting out their "Covid-19 Vaccine Safety & Effectiveness" data information dated October 22, 2020, the FDA listed 22 known adverse effects among which were included, Convulsions & Seizures, Stroke, Myocarditis/pericarditis, Autoimmune disease, Death, Pregnancy & birth outcomes, plus a number of other not so pleasant side effects. Also, we know now that the mRNA technology was the first "vaccine" to cross the blood brain barrier. Maybe the letters for the FDA should stand for Federal Death Agency as they seem to be involved with causing more harm and injury than with protecting the health of the American people. We are all led to believe that the FDA tests new drug products for safety and efficacy. But it turns out the FDA conducts no such tests and that upon receiving an application from a drug company, the FDA accepts the drug company's own test results and simply reviews the drug company's own data in order to make their determination regarding the approval of the new drug. Without doing any of their own testing and verification of the drug company's data, how is the FDA actually protecting the American people? And is it any wonder that Pfizer wanted to hide and bury all of their test data for 75 years? And why are proven nutritional supplements and natural remedies maligned and their information suppressed in favor of constantly promoting the pharmaceutical solutions with all of their known side effects as we see and hear in their TV commercials? There can be no doubt that the entire Covid episode was planned in advance, as even Dr. Fauci publicly predicted the "*surprise outbreak of an infectious pandemic*" in 2017. But how can it be a surprise if it was known about ahead of time? Those in control of our government knew they needed to change the election laws in order to secure a win in the next (2020) election, but that this could not be done without a reason to justify it... Covid provided that reason. However, it also appears that the real reason for the pandemic was to rollout

the new “vaccine” as a depopulation measure. About a dozen years ago, we began seeing a disturbing published forecast from an Intel resource company by the name of Deagel which compiles and disseminates various demographic, military and economic data on most, if not all, countries around the world, much like Janes (Defense & Security Intel). The Deagel forecast for western nations kept showing a very large decrease in population by the year 2025. For the US, the current population being reported was at about 320 million and it was being estimated to drop to 100 million by the year 2025! Also, the CEO of Pfizer, Albert Bourla, had said that they were on track to reduce the world population by 50%. At the time, years ago, the reasons for this huge drop in population were never given in the Deagle forecast and many had no idea how such a drastic decrease in population could occur, however, now we know. And this aligns perfectly with the information delivered by Dr. Rima Laebow during a 2009 appearance on a television show that Jesse Ventura hosted called, “Conspiracy Theory” (And it’s funny how almost all so-called conspiracy theories have been proven true). Dr. Laebow, MD treated a patient whom she simply identified as being a “head of state”, and who during one of their sessions said to the doctor, “*It’s almost time for the great culling*”. The patient then went on to tell the doctor that their elite group of globalists had decided that there were too many people in the world and that the planet had to be depopulated by some 50% to 90% of what their group referred to as “useless eaters”. This head of state went on to describe the manner in which this would be accomplished and went on to describe a scenario in which a pandemic would occur and a new vaccine would be introduced that would then be mandated for all to take. This forecasted event by this head of state as relayed to Dr. Rima Laebow in 2009 pretty much matches exactly what was rolled out to us during the Covid pandemic. We also now know that the government paid the media to hype the scare and this has more recently come out from the DOGE review of the funds spent by USAID. Furthermore, it is also well known now that the government, our own US government, literally placed a bounty on the heads of the American people by incentivizing doctors and hospitals to run their patients through the Covid protocols which protocols were intended to result in death. With each step along the way, starting

with the faulty PCR test to diagnose Covid (which test as per its inventor was never intended to be used as a diagnostic tool and also delivers up to 90% false positives), then the admission to ICU and prescribing Remdesivir (a drug that was already known to shut down kidney function), and then placing the patient on a ventilator, all of these events ringing the cash register until a death occurred and the COD was officially listed as Covid. And even if there were comorbidities or other factors such as serious injuries from an automobile accident or fatal gunshot wounds, these other injuries were ignored and did not prevent the COD from being listed as Covid because the payout was as high as \$500,000 per each Covid death recorded. The data today shows that 90% of Covid deaths occurred in hospitals, and 90% of those deaths are attributed to the treatment protocols used. And update information on Remdesivir shows that it also causes the death of heart cells and is cardio toxic and can lead to cardiac arrest. Yet Remdesivir remains as the only approved drug for in hospital treatment of Covid even though it is published that this drug causes, kidney failure, liver failure and now heart failure, and now, the NIH has Remdesivir as the only approved drug to treat newborns to 18 months via intravenous injection! And the pharmaceutical companies and "healthcare" providers enjoy full and complete immunity from any and all liability so for them it continues to be all profit with no downside risk. And of course, the members of the US Congress were all exempted from the Covid mandate. And it also looks like the government participated in this in other ways by both directly and indirectly doling out money to push this agenda forward by giving money to the media. Also, insurance companies were also paying out big bonuses to doctors who accepted the directive of vaccinating all or most of their patients. Blue Cross/Blue Shield was one such company. Dr. Mary Bowden, MD tells of how she could have made \$1,500,000 if she had vaccinated all the 6,000 patients she treated for Covid, and she also provided a copy of the BC/BS "Covid-19 Vaccine Provider Incentive Program" which listed all the payouts available to doctors. This is another example of how they (the institutions of government and corporations working together) are treating us like cattle. Additionally, because of the United States Congress, the United States is one of only two countries in the world which allow direct-to-consumer advertising of

prescription drugs on television, with the other country being New Zealand. Additionally, we have learned that the biggest cause of waste in Medicare has been the result of members of Congress accepting money from the pharmaceutical companies in exchange for approving much higher prices, and even astronomical prices, which leave the taxpayers picking up the bill. The result of all of this being that the average American today is taking 4 plus pharmaceutical drugs. And these drugs are NOT designed or intended to cure anything. The business model being followed is intended to maximize profits and works to achieve this goal by, "helping to manage the patient's symptoms" with pharmaceutical drugs (which all have side effects – just listen to the commercials) and to keep them on the drugs forever and to prescribe yet more drugs to treat the side effects caused by the previous prescribed drugs, as opposed working to trying to find and get to the root cause of those symptoms. Additionally, these pharmaceutical companies have generous incentive programs to compensate doctors who achieve getting a high percentage rate of their patients on these drugs. And the budgets of all the mainstream media news outlets is almost all Big Pharma money thus, the legacy media is the pharmaceutical industry's puppet mouth piece and is being paid to deliver false news reporting and stories to cover-up the truth, such as what we saw happen during the so-called Covid pandemic.

56. And pharmaceutical drugs are not the only way that the American people are being poisoned and systematically attacked. Our food is being tainted with harmful chemicals and additives which are banned in other countries. A look at the labels of food products found on the shelves at American food stores and comparing those same companies' products that are sold in Europe for example, yields a much different list of ingredients with the American label's list of ingredients being much longer and inclusive of items known to cause harm. And at this time, we are also seeing yet another attack on American's food supply as they rollout their bird flu scare. They are using the same faulty PCR test with its extreme rate of false positives to test for bird flu, and when they detect an "infected" bird, instead of isolating the infected birds, they kill all the healthy ones. The government pays the farmers for their loss, but the American people suffer a food

shortage. And isn't it odd that bird flu only seems to affect our food sources as it is only being found in chickens and in our beef cattle? There are no reports of wild birds falling out of the sky due to bird flu. Additionally, Mexico has no bird flu and the store shelves and mercados in Mexico are well supplied with eggs. And unlike here in the US where prices have skyrocketed to \$8 or more per dozen, in Mexico, eggs, sold by the kilo, are currently at about US \$1.60 a dozen.

57. Today we see certain members of Congress angry and screaming over the disclosures coming out of the DOGE reviews and audits of government spending. One of these is Senator Elizabeth Warren who has recently been extremely vocal and upset, but not over what is being uncovered, but by the fact that this audit is being carried out. However, in a 15 year old video of a younger Elizabeth Warren discussing government spending, which has been circulating on TicTok, X and YouTube, we can see and hear Elizabeth Warren say the following; "*You know when that much money disappears it's usually because somebody broke some laws somewhere. But if we don't look, if we don't ask, if we don't uncover it and make it all public we'll never find out.*" And so, what changed Elizabeth Warren from the person she appears to be back then to who we see today? Well, for one, and just like so many other members of Congress, Ms. Warren's net worth has grown substantially over the years. In 1980 at the age of 31 her net worth was reportedly \$100,000. Then by 1990 her net worth was reported at \$400,000 and then it continued to grow and skyrocketed to a reported \$12,000,000 last year in 2024. And this seems to be a very common theme among the members of Congress who are placed in office to serve the American people, but instead serve themselves up a very nice fat nest egg on taxpayer dollars while also living a lavish lifestyle as "public servants" and enjoying benefits that far exceed those available to people in the private sector, and which they vote for themselves. Nancy Pelosi has been living like a queen and has profited immensely from her time "serving" in the US Congress. Congress members could be serving honestly and be deserving of the title given them of "Honorable", but instead many of them loot shamelessly. The Founding Fathers never had in mind for the members of Congress to remain in Congress in a permanent life time position and to become so embedded into the workings

of government as to be able to pursue ever increasing power and wealth for themselves. To serve in Congress originally meant that one temporarily gave up their life in the private sector for a short period of time to contribute something towards helping to make America better, and to then later return to one's normal life in the private sector. The notion of a "professional politician" was not anything the Framers of the Constitution ever envisioned. Furthermore, these professional politicians, many of whom never worked in the private sector, or served in the military, and thus have no real world experience are placed on specialized committees where they are making important decisions on subjects and topics for which they have no real qualifications for, but then are responsible for setting policy and writing new laws and regulations that have a direct effect and impact on the policy for an entire industry or sector of the economy. This is sometimes even comical when we see them argue for more "gun control" and they don't seem to know one end of a gun from the other. And just consider what Congress did after the 1992 presidential election even after being very well warned by third party candidate Ross Perot in what he said would happen if the NAFTA trade agreement was passed. Perot said that what we would hear would be "a giant sucking sound" of manufacturing, production operations and factories leaving the United States. Our US Congress intentionally created the conditions which led to US production and manufacturing, which used to provide good paying jobs for Americans, to begin to leave our shores for cheaper labor. And it did not take very long after that before we came to see that 90% of what is today found for sale on our store shelves is coming from China and other cheap labor countries.

58. One really has to ask, that besides their own interest, whose interests do these members of Congress actually represent? With so many lobby groups, someone suggested we make all members of Congress wear decal logo and lettering on their attire just like the race car drivers so that we the people will know who they actually work for and represent. Besides the pharmaceutical industry, the other big lobby group in DC is understood to be the Israeli lobby, AIPAC (and who is not registered under FARA as a foreign agent – but how independent is AIPAC if they are setting US foreign policy?). Recently, Representative Thomas Massie appeared with

Tucker Carlson and in that interview Massie said that almost every member of Congress has an AIPAC handler, who directs them and tells them what to do and how to vote. And that oftentimes these Congress members cannot take any action or make a decision without first checking with their AIPAC puppet master. Upon seeing and hearing this from Thomas Massie, Plaintiff was reminded of what former Congresswoman from Georgia, Cynthia McKinney had said regarding her experience as a freshman representative. McKinney told of how from the very first day she began to be hounded by a number of people asking her if she had signed "The Pledge". She had no clue as to what this was all about but after a short time, McKinney later learned what this "Pledge" was. It was an agreement letter pledging your undying support for all things Israel. If a member of Congress agrees and signs the Pledge Letter, then the Israeli lobby will support the congress person and raise money for them to help them with their re-election. However, if the Congress member does not sign the Pledge Letter, then the Israeli lobby promises to spend two or three times the amount of money to run an opposing candidate to make sure that the uncooperative Congress member is unseated and loses their position in the US Congress. And according to Thomas Massie, there are only a handful of members of the US Congress that do not have an AIPAC handler. The American people should find this very disturbing as huge amounts of money gets approved and sent to Israel and then apparently some portion of these funds gets funneled back and into the pockets of these Congress members who have sold out the American people. No one can serve two masters. The American people who voted these members of Congress into office deserve to have full and complete representation of their best interests and without any conflict of interest on the part of the Congress member because he or she is beholden to the Israeli lobby or because they also hold dual citizenship and have an Israeli passport. This has to be seen for what it is, a direct violation of their oath of office and a betrayal of the American people, because if they are not putting America and the American people's interest first and above all others, then they are not performing their duty as representatives of the American people. Understand that this has nothing to do with Jewish people as the same would be said if a major portion of the US

Congress held Mexican passports or British passports or from any other country and they had signed pledge agreements to these other countries to always render their support and to always vote to favor the policies that were beneficial to these other countries even when those interests might conflict with the best interests of the American people. There has to be something very wrong with all of this as even the Speaker of the House upon securing the required votes to secure the Speaker's position, the first words that came out of Mike Johnson's mouth were that he pledges his full support for Israel... Why would this be the most important thing for the new Speaker of the House to say in that situation, rather than making some statement about working towards the best interest and betterment of the American people? This can only mean one thing, that America and the American people's interest are second to those of Israel.

59. Understand, Plaintiff has no dog in this fight over the lands in the Middle East and neither backs or supports either side, and also could really hardly care less who ultimately wins that struggle over this territory, except to say this, innocent people including women and children should not be made to suffer. Even war has its rules, and women and children are NOT legitimate military targets. Beside the inordinate number of bombs dropped on Gaza, there are far too many videos showing innocent women and children walking through the street just trying to make their way through the rubble of what is left of their homes and neighborhoods to try to find food and shelter, then we see them intentionally being targeted by IDF snipers and falling dead to the ground. It takes a real special kind of evil to put your rifle sights on a young child and to then pull the trigger. This is in no way collateral damage, it is intentional genocide, and the United States is complicit in allowing this to continue to be carried out. Reported Palestinian deaths in Gaza thus far are over 45,000 of which 7,216 were women, 3,447 were elderly, and 13,319 were children. The Jewish people are often heard calling out, "*Never again, we must never let this happen again*" in referring to the Holocaust. But what does that mean, that we should only never let it happen to Jews again? What about other groups of people? Should not this "Never Again" thought and prayer also apply to all people, including the Palestinian people of Gaza? One can only hope that when this fighting

is finally over that there will be a real investigative commission formed to investigate the events from the start of this episode on October 7th, 2023. Because as we all know, false flag attacks are often used to start a war, and this one has many unanswered questions, such as what happened to all that excellent tight Israeli security that seemed to have completely failed and allowed invaders to cross into Israeli territory? And why did it take so long to respond to this attack? And why does the damage to the vehicles in the parking lot look more like it was from aerial fire and not from hand held weapons? And why is there a "Greater Israel" map showing this huge expansion of Israel taking up sections of neighboring countries, and why is this Greater Israel map seen being worn on the uniforms of Israeli soldiers? It sure looks like this entire war in Gaza is merely the execution of the Israeli plans for the expansion of Israel. And then also, there is something very strange about this hold that Israel has on the government of the United States, such that past and current Israeli Prime Ministers and leaders have often expressed their overwhelming confidence in knowing that they would always get what they want from the US. For example: David Ben-Gurion, first Prime Minister: "*We have the Americans in our pocket.*" And then this from Prime Minister Menachem Begin: "*We control America, and the Americans know it.*" And from well-known Israeli journalist; Ari Shavit, "*Israel is in a position where it can push American policies, and it does so regularly. The U.S. will stand by Israel, no matter what Israel does.*" And so, if there are so many members of the US Congress who have this "pledge agreement" with the Israeli lobby, what agreement(s) does the US government have with Israel? Is it such that Israel will not only always be supported and be given financial aid, but also that Israel will always be forgiven any "indiscretions or mistakes"? On June 8th, 1967 a United States Naval vessel, the USS Liberty was attacked by Israeli air forces while operating in international waters in the Mediterranean. The USS Liberty was flying the American flag and had all the markings to show that it was a US Naval vessel. Yet it was violently attacked by Israeli air forces with the intent to sink the ship. Accounts from the survivors of the Liberty tell of seeing the Israeli jet aircraft flying in so low that they could see the faces of the pilots. Radio calls for help went out and a US carrier ship within range set out to respond, however, they

were immediately given the order to stand down... orders that came directly from Washington! Some accounts say that President Johnson said he wanted that ship (the USS Liberty) at the bottom of the sea. But somehow the USS Liberty survived and limped its way to port having suffered a loss of 34 deaths and 171 injured among its crew members. One of the survivors of the USS Liberty recently appeared with, and was interviewed by, Candice Owens. He recounted the event and told of how there was no doubt whatsoever that those Israeli aircraft knew they were attacking a US Naval vessel. He also told of how upon reaching port, the immediate orders, given with extreme threat to all crew members, was to remain silent about this event and to never speak of it. With any other country having carried out such an attack, it would have been seen for what it was, an intentional attack on a US Naval vessel in international waters and thus, an act of war being carried out against the United States! And yet to this day there has been no accountability for this act. And then also there was the Libyan Arab Airlines Flight 114 that was shot down by Israel in 1973 after it got lost due to bad weather. Israeli fighter jets shot down the Libyan commercial airliner over the Sinai Peninsula, killing all 113 people onboard (all innocent civilians). The U.S. response was relatively muted, with no substantial condemnation or change in policy toward Israel. So, what exactly is this hold and control that Israel has on the government of the American people? George Washington had this to say about foreign entanglements; "*It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world.*" The US should have heeded Washington's advice and should also have never pursued ambitions of empire building.

60. America is a beautiful nation and one that has beautiful and abundant natural resources such that America has always been, and still is, capable of providing all the food and energy needs of the people that live here. America has everything it needs to be totally self-sufficient. And if its government worked today as it was intended to work as per its founding documents and as per the directives and prohibitions of our Constitution, we would have a country beloved and admired by all the rest of the world and one that would be the true shining light for the rest of the world. But instead because we have allowed the infiltration by subversive elements

whose goal has been to see America destroyed, we have made enemies around the world and have allowed this country to fall to a low point from which it may not easily recover. The Roman statesman and philosopher, Marcus Tullius Cicero said; "*A nation can survive its fools, and even the ambitious. But it cannot survive treason from within. An enemy at the gates is less formidable, for he is known and carries his banner openly. But the traitor moves amongst those within the gate freely, his sly whispers rustling through all the alleys, heard in the very halls of government itself.*"

61. Plaintiff has laid out his case for why the government has the duty to protect the individual Right of the people to keep and bear arms and why the government is prohibited by the United States Constitution from infringing on this Right via any law, statute or regulation or by the imposition of any fee or licensing requirement. Every law abiding citizen or legal resident of legal age has the constitutionally protected right to keep and bear arms. The only acceptable exceptions should be for those individuals who have demonstrated their disregard for the law by becoming convicted felons for serious or violent crimes, and of course also those individuals who are deemed to be mentally unstable. But other than that, all others who are of legal age should NOT be denied the Right to keep and bear arms. And this access to firearms and other weapons by responsible law abiding citizens should not be restricted or infringed upon the imposition of government regulations. As for the laws which maybe should be passed regarding firearms, these should be laws which promote the education and knowledge of firearms to all members of the public, including our children. Children should not be made to fear firearms, but instead to know about and to respect what firearms are for and of the danger they can pose if handled incorrectly or carelessly, just like any other tool. We teach our children not to play with matches, and so this idea of teaching them firearms safety is akin to what we teach our children about automobiles. Although we know that a child is too young to own or to operate an automobile, we recognize that because automobiles exist in our society and children are exposed to them, that children, just like adults, need to know something about automobiles and of that dangers automobiles can pose. We therefore recognize

the need to teach children the rules of the road and of the dangers of moving cars. We teach them to obey the crossing lights when crossing the street at the intersection, we teach and warn them to not step out into the street without first looking both ways, we teach them not to enter onto a street from between two parked cars as oncoming traffic will not be able to see them until it's too late for them to stop. We teach them these and many other things regarding how to stay safe from harm around automobiles. However, what does the average child today (especially those that grow up in American cities), what do these children know today about the safe handling of firearms? Children are by their very nature curious, and a young boy who knows where his father keeps his gun may want to impress a friend (which may be your son or daughter) by showing off that gun which even though it may be locked away, the boy knows enough to be able to gain access and begins to handle the gun in an unsafe manner beginning with first failing to clear the weapon to ensure it is safe to handle. And neither he nor the other child knows enough to know that they have created and entered into a dangerous situation. And when something like this happens, it is because neither child knows any better. And they don't know any better because they were never taught anything about firearms safety. The mandatory teaching of all children the four basic rules of firearms safety should be right there alongside reading, writing and arithmetic. We cannot, and should not, try to create a "safety bubble" for all to live under. As Ron Paul put it, "*Freedom is not defined by safety. Freedom is defined by the ability of the citizens to live without government interference. Government can't create a world without risks, nor would we really wish to live in such a fictional place*". As mentioned earlier, in our not too distant history, guns were very much an open part of our culture and our society. Children trained and practiced sport shooting at school sponsored events. And the presence of a firearms was never anything to become alarmed about... and there were no mass shootings during this time in our history. This is what the American people deserve and what America should return to. *Regnat Populus*

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully prays for judgment as follows:

1. Injunctive Relief:

That the Court issue an injunction requiring Defendants to immediately cease and desist from continuing the unlawful, unconstitutional, and unauthorized conduct described herein, including the failure to comply with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and the violations of the Plaintiff's constitutional rights.

2. Declaratory Relief:

That the Court issue a declaratory judgment that the actions of the Defendants, including but not limited to the wrongful withholding of records under FOIA, and their violation of the Plaintiff's constitutional rights, including the many infringements on the Right of the people to "keep and bear arms" as protected by the Second Amendment of the Constitution, and the deprivation of due process and equal protection, are unlawful and unconstitutional, and furthermore, that as such being the case that the BATF is an unconstitutional agency, that the BATF be declared unconstitutional and immediately be shut down and disbanded.

3. Compensatory Damages:

That the Court award Plaintiff compensatory damages in an amount to be determined at trial, for the harm caused by the Defendants' violations of FOIA, the Constitution, and the Plaintiff's rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

4. Punitive Damages:

That the Court award Plaintiff punitive damages in an amount sufficient to deter future misconduct by the Defendants, and to punish the Defendants for their willful, malicious, and intentional violations of the law and the Plaintiff's rights.

5. Attorney's Fees and Costs:

Although at this time Plaintiff is pursuing this case *pro se*, at such time as Plaintiff may choose to engage the services of legal counsel to conclude with this case, Plaintiff asks the court to award Plaintiff reasonable attorney's fees, costs, and expenses incurred in bringing and prosecuting this action, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(E), 42 U.S.C. § 1988, and any other applicable statutes.

6. Corrective Actions:

That the Court order Defendants to take immediate and specific actions to remedy the violations described herein, including the release of any unlawfully withheld FOIA documents and compliance with all applicable legal standards, statutes, and regulations.

7. Relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983:

That the Court grant any and all relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, including but not limited to the award of damages for the deprivation of Plaintiff's constitutional rights.

8. Other Relief:

That the Court grant such other and further relief as it may deem just, proper, and equitable under the circumstances, including the imposition of any sanctions as appropriate.

Dated this 4th day of March, 2025



~~Arturo Cornejo, Plaintiff, pro se~~

Arturo Cornejo
P.O. Box 193
Menomonee Falls, WI 53052